

A decorative border with symmetrical floral and scrollwork patterns in a dark green color, framing the central text.

Raymond's Systematic Theology Vol 01

Miner Raymond

Primary Copyright:
Digitizer, J. Prescott
Johnson

1040 E. 3rd Ave.

Monmouth, IL 61462

All Rights Reserved By
HDM For This Digital
Publication Copyright
1993--2005 Holiness Data
Ministry

Duplication of this disc (CD or DVD) by any means is forbidden, and copies of individual files must be made in accordance with the restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this disc.

**SYSTEMATIC
THEOLOGY –
VOLUME I**

By Miner Raymond

* * * * *

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

**Miner Raymond, D. D.,
LL. D**

Miner Raymond, of French descent, the eldest son of Nobles and Hannah (Wood) Raymond, was born on August 29, 1811, in New York City. As a youth he lived, with his parents, in the village of Rensselaerville, New York. Here he received his early education, which he completed at the age of twelve. For the next six years he worked in his

father's shoe-making shop, and became proficient in that work.

Miner Raymond's parents were devout members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Their home was always open to Methodist ministers. The turning-point in his life was precipitated by his reading of a great revival at Wilbraham, Massachusetts, kindling in him a desire for further knowledge. With the help of the presiding elder of the district in which he resided, he enrolled in the

1834 he was made head of the English Department, a position he held for four years. In 1838 he was appointed chair of the Mathematics Department. During these years, he became proficient in the sciences, ancient languages, and higher mathematics.

Professor Raymond joined the New England Conference in 1838, and in 1842 entered upon the pastoral work, serving several churches in the area.

holiness, literature. As one will see when he or she reads the text, Dr. Raymond expressed his thought in plain language that is readily understood. The work became very popular.

During Professor Raymond's years at Garrett, he also helped to direct the work of the church in its national councils.

He received the D. D. degree in 1854 from Wesleyan University, and the LL. D degree in 1884

has written about Dr. Raymond:

“With him religion was the main consideration, and his convictions on the subject were deep and strongly expressed. He spoke with the demonstration of the spirit and power. If his prayers and exhortations were thoughtful and intellectual, they were, at the same time, intense and fervent, enlisting the emotions of the heart as well as the accurate formulations of the brain. . . .

Though gifted with a large capacity for astute and accurate thought, he was gladly heard by the people, because his logic usually came to a white heat." J. Prescott Johnson

SYSTEMATIC
THEOLOGY.

BY

MINER RAYMOND, D. D.,
PROFESSOR IN GARRETT
BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
EVANSTON, ILL

VOLUME I.

CINCINNATI: CURTS &
JENNINGS..

NEW YORK: EATON &
MAINS.

Entered, according to Act
of Congress, in 1877, by
Hitchcock & Walden,

In the Office of the
Librarian of Congress at
Washington.

PREFACE.

In the volumes here
presented, the Evidences,
Doctrines, Duties, and
Institutions of the
Christian Religion, as the
author understands them,
are stated and defended
with as much brevity and
simplicity as the nature of

the subject and the author's ability allowed. The doctrines considered, and the general line of thought pursued, differ not essentially from what is common in works of the kind. The topics discussed are viewed from modern stand-points. This has necessitated a more extended discussion than is usual of the Origin, Antiquity, and Unity of the race, the distinction between natural and revealed religion, and the possibility of the former; the doctrine of Intuition as applied in matters of

religion; the Positive Philosophy, the doctrine of Evolution, and other phases of modern materialism; the distinction between the Augustinian and Arminian theories of Federal Headship, and specially the wide difference between the Anselmic and Arminian Soteriologies.

History is not attempted; no reliance is placed upon authorities; information as to the opinions of authors, ancient or modern, is given only so far as seemed serviceable in

of the most common and most obvious arguments for and against. Authorities, speculations, nice distinctions, side issues, and novelties, if given at all, should be given in the recitation room, in the form of lectures, discussions, and conversations. Though the wants of the student in the Theological Seminary have been most appropriately present to thought in preparation of the work, the author has been mindful of that large class of ministers who acquire most of their theological

found to be what he has designed to make them.

M. RAYMOND.

EVANSTON, February,
1877.

THE two volumes now published treat of the Evidences and Doctrines of Religion. A third volume will follow, treating of Christian Ethics, the Sacraments, and Church Polity.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME
I.

INTRODUCTION.

BOOK FIRST.

APOLOGETICS.

Chapter I. REVELATION
PROBABLE.

Chapter 2. ARGUMENT
FIRST—MIRACLES.

Chapter 3. ARGUMENT
SECOND—PROPHECY.

Chapter 4. ARGUMENT
THIRD—INTERNAL
EVIDENCE.

Chapter 5. ARGUMENT
FOURTH—COLLATERAL
EVIDENCES.

Chapter 6. ARGUMENT
FIFTH—ARGUMENT
FROM EXPERIENCE.

Chapter 7. SUMMARY OF
ARGUMENTS.

Chapter 8. HISTORICAL
SKETCH.

Comment: VI.1.
HISTORIC

SKETCH, 226

BOOK SECOND.

THEOLOGY PROPER.

Chapter 1. THE BEING OF
GOD.

Chapter 2. ATTRIBUTES
OF GOD.

Chapter 3. TRINITY.

Chapter 4. BIBLE PROOFS
OF TRINITY.

Chapter 5. PERSONALITY
AND DIVINITY OF THE
HOLY SPIRIT.

Chapter 6. DIRECT
TESTIMONY AS TO THE
TRINITY.

Chapter 7. THE
GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

INTRODUCTION.

THE science of theology,
like every other, may be
said to be complete in itself
from the beginning, and
therefore incapable of
increase, or, on the other
hand, perpetually

faith." But back of this just and wise determination arise other highly important questions respecting the real purport of what "may be read therein," and what may be rationally and truly "proved thereby."

To respond to these secondary questions is the purpose alike of Biblical criticism and interpretation, and of systematic theology. While, therefore, as to its fundamental elements, Christian theology was perfected, when the volume

essentially better than those to whose places they accede; it is enough if they are better adapted to the demands of their own times. Methodism, though not primarily and distinctively theological (in the narrower sense of that term), has always held fast to a clearly ascertained and distinctly pronounced system of religious opinions. It is theistical, as opposed to atheism, and its theism is that of the Bible, as understood and accepted by the prevalent consent of the general Church through all its ages;

embracing the great truth of the divine unity, as revealed to the patriarchs and prophets of the earlier dispensations, and of the tri-personality of the Godhead, as taught more clearly in the later and fuller revelations of the gospel. Its doctrinal positions and associations are with the great body of those who accept the essential truths of traditional catholic orthodoxy, holding steadily to the teachings of the Bible in their most direct and rational meaning. It is, therefore, Protestant as

opposed to Romish, in respect to both what it rejects and what it allows. It accepts and emphasizes the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation, of sin, of redemption by Christ, of spiritual quickening, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, of the life of faith on earth, and everlasting life after death. These things, with their resultant considerations and practical consequences were the burden of early Methodist preaching; and because they were assailed from different quarters, Methodism at length

embody, with more or less fullness, the whole body of evangelical divinity.

The hymns of the Wesleys, which their people sung everywhere and continually, were surcharged with their theology, and so it happened that through the agency of Christian psalmody, the doctrinal opinions of the Methodist people became strangely harmonized and greatly intensified. While as yet Methodism was without even a written system of theology, there prevailed

an almost unequaled uniformity of doctrinal opinions among them.

It was thirty years after the death of Mr. Wesley, and eighty after the origin of Wesleyan Methodism that its first formal and comprehensive system of theology was issued,—the Theological Institutes of Rev. Richard Watson. As the Methodist bodies of both Great Britain and America had long felt the need of such an exposition and embodiment of "those things which were most surely believed among

them," but which had not before been "set forth in order," "the advent of that great work was hailed with great joy. And yet its real value for Methodism was but partially appreciated, and its service to the denomination has been great beyond possible computation. The time had come in the growth and development of Methodism that a common standard of doctrines, thoroughly elaborated and set forth with such ability as to command the respect of intelligent and independent thinkers, was

a necessity as a condition of continued harmony in the doctrinal views of the body, and of safety against the seductive influence of the then incipient modern rationalistic unbelief. And this important purpose it accomplished most effectually. To no other single agency is the continued doctrinal unity of Methodism so much indebted as to the extensive use of Watson's Theological Institutes. In the two spacious volumes in which the work has usually appeared is contained a complete

system of theological instruction and culture,—

Evidences, Doctrines, Institutions, and Morals. In style it is grave, yet animated, and not inelegant. It is learned, yet not at all pedantic, and though treating of subjects that are sustained by the most sacred sanctions of authority, yet is there an almost entire absence of dogmatism. And though, from the necessities of the case it is the farthest removed from light reading, yet to the interested student of the

the Church on both sides of the sea. It is at once succinct, and comprehensive, exceedingly clear in its statements, and both progressive and conservative in its doctrinal views and statements, and most thoroughly orthodox according to the standards, and the traditional teachings of Methodism. It is reported that the author intends thoroughly to revise his work, so as to express more satisfactorily his own opinions, and embody the doctrinal system of Wesleyan

Methodism, and better to adapt it to general use.

The work of Dr. Raymond, herewith given to the public, is the fruit of a long course of studies and teachings in the subjects discussed. It goes forth without official authorization, further than its authorship, and the medium through which it proceeds gives it a semi-official character. It professedly sets forth the doctrinal convictions of its author,—all which, however, are believed to be in substantial agreement

the first are made more definite, and the grounds upon which they rest appropriately indicated. The design and scope of the work are such as to enable the careful and intelligent reader to apprehend the general truths of religion, and to know what are the grounds upon which believers build their faith and hopes.

The advancements made within the last half century, in both Biblical and physical learning, and the more thorough exploration of ancient monuments and

the influences designed to be effected upon the heart and life. The living truths here brought into view, with all the force of evident convictions of their verity, on the part of him that utters them, and also enforced and vitalized by recognized personal interest in them of the writer himself, changes what would otherwise be a dry array of facts into living and quickening principles, and replaces a formal recitation by a life-giving testimony. All this will be found in these pages by those whose spiritual

susceptibilities qualify them to profit by what they read, and to all such the work is commended as able to make wise, without entailing any curse.

D. C.

CINCINNATI, May, 1877.

**BOOK ONE:
APOLOGETICS;
OR,
EVIDENCES OF
CHRISTIANITY**

CHAPTER REVELATION PROBABLE.

1:

ARE there adequate reasons for the affirmation that what the Bible says, God says? The importance of this question cannot be overstated. For, though It be admitted that a pure theism is rationally possible, and therefore logically obligatory, it is obvious that the doctrine of a revelation from God is fundamental to Christianity. That God is, and is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him,

that man is morally responsible, that he is immortal, and that he is destined to future retribution, are doctrines which may possibly be satisfactorily evident on rational grounds. But if man is ever assured that God has a Son equal with himself in power and eternity, that pardon is possible only through a propitiation of infinite merit made by Deity incarnate, that providence relates to even the most minute of earthly existences and events, and that prayer is efficacious,

that what the Bible says, God says, are such as are apprehended by intuition and logical inference. The state of mind requisite to a fair and proper examination does not differ from that essential to a proper judgment on any other topic of discussion. Such a state of mind includes an intense desire to know the truth, a fixed purpose and disposition to adopt and practice the truth when known, and a desire that that which is desirable may be found to be true.

The affirmation that the Bible is a revelation from God postulates the Divine Existence: God actually existing, as opposed to atheism; personal as opposed to pantheism; and one, as opposed to polytheism. What we may deem it necessary to say in respect to these things, will be reserved for discussion under the head of Theology Proper. At present, our controversy is with those who accept the doctrine of the divine being and attributes, as generally understood by Christians and intelligent theists.

unanswerable argument for the necessity of a revelation. But when taken in the sense intended, as an affirmation interrogatively stated, of a natural and necessary impossibility, it is simply preposterous. Though the finite cannot elevate itself to the infinite, the infinite can condescend to the finite. He who created man with power to commune with his fellow-man in thought, sympathy, and affection, can open channels of communication with the creatures he has made. Cannot he that made the ear, hear? Cannot he

the efficacy and utility of *prayer*.

Second, because, with very inconsiderable exceptions, the teachings of natural religion are nearly, or quite, unavailable for the masses or mankind.

Third, because. in the conditions of most men in this life, religious truth is liable to corruption from admixture with error to such a degree as to render it well-nigh inoperative.

THE PARDON OF SIN.

There is in universal consciousness a distinctly

word, all men have a conscious conviction that man is made under law—law properly considered; not mere precept, not mere advice, but requirement with corresponding consequences; precept with penalty.

All men are conscious that they have violated obligation.

All men know that they have sinned and that they are, therefore, exposed to the penalties of sin, whatever they may be. The penalties of sin, so far forth as their character and

providence, in the light of reason, teach that when God's laws are transgressed impunity is impossible, that the hope of pardon, under the divine administration, is presumptuous.

But, it will be said, the universal conviction of mankind that God is merciful is sufficient assurance. Let it be granted that this is a bar to absolute despair; and yet, we ask, is it adequate ground for hope? Though pardon may be a possibility, it yet remains to inquire on what

conditions, by what process, to whom granted, and how obtained? Do you say pardon is unconditioned and universal? That were plainly the abrogation of law and the annihilation of government, it postulates the failure of authority, a want of wisdom in the legislator, and utter weakness in the administration. Nor is this objection to indiscriminate pardon obviated by the thought that God is sole sovereign, that pardon may be by divine prerogative; since the very idea of law

when an aggressor with penitence confesses his fault and asks forgiveness, the aggrieved, if a good man, will surely forgive him. If, then, pardon on condition of repentance be characteristic of human goodness, surely we may reasonably infer as much from the infinite goodness of God. We reply: Repentance may be an adequate adjustment of personal injuries, as between one individual and another, but evidently it does not at all affect the legal relations subsisting between the criminal

blessings, is it presumable that he has revealed his will concerning the forgiveness of sin and the conditions on which pardon may be obtained.

PROVIDENCE.

Does natural religion furnish satisfactory instructions respecting the doctrine of Divine Providence? That God governs the world is a truth fundamental to all religion. It is the basis of all trust and consolation in pious minds. So far forth, then, as theism is anything at all, it must be built on a

government by established immutable law. The idea of such a thing as a personal attention to the affairs of a single individual or to the minute events of human history, much more such a thing as a direct interference of divine efficiency in the individual interests of anyone, must, in the light of natural religion, be regarded as a superstition.

Such a faith is manifestly inadequate to the purposes of religion. Gratitude for favors received, for blessings enjoyed,

submission to afflictions endured, trust and confidence through the ever-varying vicissitudes of the present life, certainly require something more. Under the trials, sufferings, and sorrows incident to man's earthly experience, adequate support and consolation cannot be found in anything less than a well-authenticated conviction that all things, even the least important events of human history, are by divine wisdom and power put under contribution for the highest good. Insomuch then as

faith in an overruling providence is essential to right-mindedness toward God, essential to competent support and consolation in the experiences of life, by so much is a revelation from God, giving satisfactory assurances of divine guidance, protection, and provision, presumable, or antecedently probable.

PRAYER.

It is asserted, probably with truth, that all men at one time or another, especially in times of trouble, feel an instinctive

beginning directly from God.

But it is one thing to be able to discover truth, and another after it is discovered and clearly stated, with the reasons on which it is grounded, to be able to apprehend it as truth. In this discussion it is admitted that the doctrines of natural religion, though probably not discoverable by unaided reason, may be satisfactorily recognized as true when the arguments for their affirmation are clearly stated. But with this

admission we affirm that but few minds are competent to such an apprehension of these truths as is requisite for the purposes of morals and religion. To the mass of mankind they are a *terra incognita*, a record written in an unknown tongue. That this is so seems evident from the difficulties of the subjects. Suppose that all men, idiots and lunatics only excepted, are competent to apprehend immediately, on its statement, the fact of the divine existence, and that they intuitively

knowledge as is attainable only by instruction?

Such a knowledge as an elevated devotion requires is obtained only by such mental processes as are experienced when thought comprehends the usual ontological, cosmological, teleological, or moral arguments for the being of God. Now, leave the last, the moral or experiential argument, and take either of the others, say the most simple, the teleological.

Doubtless the common mind at once admits that many things evince design

and that design implies a designer, therefore the world must have had a maker; that is, there is a God. But it must be manifest that but few, if any, among the masses of mankind are competent so to penetrate the depths of this problem as to master its metaphysics, as appreciably to develop their original intuitive idea. Progress by the processes of natural religion is to them an impossibility for the want either of natural endowment or educational acquirement, and in most cases for the want of both

antagonism to these truths, an unwillingness that they should be true, which bias is an effectual bar to successful investigation.

Are the teachings of natural religion sufficient for the purposes of good morals?

The process by which man without an authoritative revelation must learn his duty, is by experiment. If, by actual trial, a course of conduct be found to be detrimental to man's best interests, he will possibly infer that such a course is morally wrong; and if the

have been in the world from the beginning.

These have all indicated, to some extent, God's will and man's duty. Under the influence of these and, as we think, with the addition of some reflected light from revelation, the minds of some men here and there, one or more at least in all the ages, have attained an appreciable scholarship in philosophy, science, art, and religion. The experiment has had a fair opportunity, and what the race could or would do for itself, by the aids of a

natural religion, has been fully and fairly tested, so that the records of history furnish a fair exponent for a correct judgment in the case. The result is set forth clearly and truthfully in Paul's letter to the Romans, chapter first. We quote him here, not as authority because inspired, but as we would quote from the writings of any other historian or philosopher whose productions commend themselves to acceptance as evidently correct and truthful. Herein it is stated that "the wrath of God is revealed

from heaven against all ungodliness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them. . . . For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse." That is to say, as when men perceive the qualities of matter they must, from the necessary laws of thought, apprehend substance in which quality inheres, and space in which

knowledge, did not glorify him as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible men, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. They changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed

things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." We present this as a truthful representation of the heathen world as it has been generally in all the ages, and as it is now, with inconsiderable exceptions; and we affirm that this state of things is a natural result of the "wisdom of this world," a natural result of that philosophy which rejects revelation as unnecessary and improbable, and trusts to unaided reason to interpret God's will as indicated in the

not, attain without a further revelation of his will than is made in nature and providence, it is fairly presumable that such a revelation has been somehow and somewhere given. Should it be said that the argument from the moral and religious condition the heathen world to the necessity of a revelation, and the consequent probability that a revelation has been given, proves too much, since the same argument may be made from the present condition of Christendom to the necessity and

from an admixture with error; since this deficiency in the teachings of natural religion, this inability on the part of the masses of mankind to interpret and appropriate whatever may be discovered by the light of nature, and this tendency to a corruption of truth by admixture with error, have been in all the ages an effectual bar to a high state of morals and religion, as is plainly evinced by the actual condition of the heathen world—their condition as exhibited in their prevalent systems of ethics,

within the province of logical discussion, we return to the question itself.

CHAPTER 2: ARGUMENT FIRST: MIRACLES.

“Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.”

THE Scriptures affirm that "God at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past, unto the fathers by the prophets, and in

these last days has spoken unto us by his Son." This claim to a divine authority on the part of the writers and teachers of the sacred Scriptures extends to all the books of the Holy Bible. Moses asserted that God spake to him out of a burning bush, that on Mount Sinai God talked with him face to face, and gave him the law and the testimonies which he communicated to the people. The prophets all preface their teachings with the declaration, "thus saith the Lord." Christ said, "I came down from heaven

not to speak my own words, but the words of Him that sent me." He referred to Moses and the prophets, to the book of the Psalms, and to all the books of the Jewish Scriptures, in such a manner as indicates that he regarded them as of divine authority. Matthew and the other writers of the Gospels, Paul and the authors of the Epistles all claim that not only were the ancient Scriptures given by inspiration of God, but also that the word which the people heard and received of them was not

the word of man but in truth the word of God.

This claim to a divine authority for their teachings they ever maintain by a reference to signs and wonders, which, they affirm, had been wrought in the presence of the people to whom they were sent, and wrought by the power of God, under their direction, for this specific purpose—to authenticate their mission as divinely appointed teachers of God's will and word.

The Scriptures very plainly claim that the signs and wonders wrought in Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the Pillar of fire by night and of cloud by day, the water from the smitten rock, the manna from heaven, the entire events of the Exodus, the passage of Jordan and the downfall of Jericho, were events which occurred, and could only occur, by the intervention of divine power. The same thing is maintained through all the writings of the prophets and in New Testament times. When it was inquired, What sign

showest thou? Christ replied, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. When John sent his disciples to inquire whether Christ was he that should come, or should they look for another, Christ said, Go show John the things ye do hear and see: the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the blind see, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them. In a word, the Bible claims to be a divinely given book; given as an authoritative rule of faith and practice, as a

Now, if this argument be sustained it must be regarded as determinative. The case is this: A man presents himself as a teacher of religion; he claims divine authority for his teachings, that is, he claims that what he says, God says; and as evidence that his claim is valid he proposes to do, and does do, what no man can do except God be with him. Works are performed under his direction, professedly for the purpose of authenticating his mission, which, beyond question, require the

POSSIBILITY OF MIRACLES.

Efforts have been made to show on scientific grounds that miracles are impossible. If such efforts be in any degree successful, so far forth as they are successful it must be manifest that any examination of evidence addressed in proof of the actual occurrence of miracles must be premature. On this topic, however, a brief reply is deemed sufficient. The argument in substance is this: Nature's laws are

directly or indirectly by his agency, and that what are termed natural laws are only his ways of working—we assume that it is perfectly competent to conceive that God can do, in the presence of man, what will be in itself a demonstration to man that God did it.

PROBABILITY OF MIRACLES.

On the antecedent probability or improbability that such an event as a miracle would ever transpire, volumes have been written, and to

contradicts himself, working in one way at one time and oppositely at another; or that this doctrine supposes God's works imperfect, rendering it necessary for him to undo at one time what he had done at an other—has just been answered in what we have said about miracles as violations of nature's laws.

The definition of the old theologians is this: “A miracle is an effect or event contrary to the established course of things, or a sensible suspension or

phenomena. This objection, as stated by Hume and repeated a thousand and one times since, is in substance this: Experience is the foundation of human confidence; it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true; it is in accordance with experience that testimony should be false: therefore, no testimony can be adequate to substantiate a miracle. Of course the objector does not intend to say that a miracle is contrary to all experience, for that would be too evidently begging

truths upon which we most confidently rely, which underlie nearly all our acts in life, and upon which we depend in all the matters that interest us, in all the faith we exercise, in all the hopes we indulge, is derived from the testimony of others, and not from our own individual experience. Until children learn by experience to lose confidence in the testimony of others, they naturally believe all that is told them. In the constitution and laws of the present life it is easier, most natural, more consonant with the nature

govern his conduct in accordance with it.

The phrase “accordance with experience” designates the same thing as is usually intended when we speak of the probability of testimony; “contrary to experience” expresses the same as improbability of testimony, and in speaking of works of fiction

Comment: contrary to the same idea is denoted by the term “natural.” All of these expressions express the same as express an affirmation that the fact stated, or the occurrence

ordinances, ceremonies, creeds, politics, and histories—facts to be accounted for, evidences addressed to sense and reason. The origin and subsequent histories of these institutions must be what the Biblical and ecclesiastical histories assert they were, because the nature of the case is such that the contrary is impossible.

Suppose that Abraham was not the father of the Jewish nation, that Moses was not their law giver, that they were never in bondage in

published at some time subsequently.

That this is impossible is abundantly evident. That the historical records of a nation, with all of, its civil laws, both constitutional and statutory, its civil jurisprudence, its religious creed, its ceremonies of worship, its ecclesiastical polity, its land titles, its domestic economies, its commercial relations, its philosophies, arts, sciences, and systems of education, its genealogies and tribe distinctions, indeed, all that pertains to it as a

nation, both that which it has in common with other nations and that which distinguishes it from others—

that such records, in the possession of thousands, known and read of all, taught to all their children under the injunction of a sacred obligation, preserved in halls of legislation, in courts of justice, in the king's palace, in all places of power in Church and State, and held as sole and authoritative guide in the administration of all governmental and

been written and published; and this is proof conclusive that the people who are therein referred to as eye and ear witnesses of the events therein recorded were eye and ear witnesses of those events.

UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Have we the record as it was originally written? What security have we that the Bible has been preserved uncorrupted?

May we not suppose that though as to its general

with substantial correctness in the pentateuch and the gospels; the founders of the Old and New Testament religions believed that they were called by a supernatural vocation to be teachers of religion; they believed that the signs and wonders wrought through their instrumentality were wrought by the power of God, by a special and immediate incomming of the divine agency. But, in the judgment of modern rationalists: these men. were deceived, and through them their followers in all

the succeeding ages, so far forth as they have been believers in the supernatural and miraculous, have also been deceived. It is now affirmed that the Bible, interpreted by a scholarly exegesis, interpreted in the light of modern science, proper allowance being made for man's natural love of the marvelous, for the perpetual effort of all religionists to elevate themselves into communion with the gods, and for the poetic and mythical character of oriental nations, may be

remaining longer than anticipated, were careful of their supplies, and naturally averse to any hospitable distribution.

The condition of the multitude becoming an occasion of solicitude on the part of the disciples, they besought the Master to dismiss the assembly, in order that the people might go and buy bread for themselves. The Master said to them, Distribute your supplies.

Always obedient, they did as commanded. The example took effect, and all

well known during the lifetime of the then existing generation.

The gospels were written with a knowledge of the facts in the minds of the writers; commentaries immediately subsequent must have corresponded with the facts; and the bold commentator who should attempt such an innovation and subversion of so plain a case must have awakened a remonstrance of which it is reasonable to suppose the records of the Church would have given some account. The record itself

says that "they that did eat *of the loaves* were about five thousand men," not "they that did eat of what was given them by their friends;" again, "the two fishes divided he among them all," not to as many as the two fishes were sufficient for a supply, as an example for others to divide the contents of their baskets among the destitute. The Savior, on a subsequent occasion, when they were on shipboard, entirely destitute of food, and the disciples supposed that in what the Master said about the leaven of the

about their daily bread and from any suspicion that he himself was thus anxious.

The Gospel record of the event and the interpretation given to that record, so far as we know, from the beginning, sets it forth as a miracle of power nothing less than divine. The rationalistic interpretation in this instance is, to say the most of it, barely possible—none given to anyone of the numerous instances of miraculous events recorded in the Bible is more plausible than this; few, if

Are these things so? Were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Jeremiah, and Isaiah; were Zachariah, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ the Lord, John the beloved disciple, Peter, Paul, and James, enthusiasts? Did they in the occurrences of their private experiences and their public ministrations fully believe that God was with them, doing by and through them works which no man can do except God be with him, when in reality and in fact God was no more with them then

the part of Moses was not to demonstrate that monotheism is the true theology (probably the Egyptians were not prepared for such a doctrine, however demonstrated), but to make known Jehovah's power, to show that he is a God to be feared and obeyed; and the result shows beyond reasonable doubt, that by the power of God he accomplished his purpose.

That he did so seems sufficiently evidenced in the fact that the magicians

themselves, after a few efforts, abandoned the contest, saying, "This is the finger of God." The multiplication of miraculous works did not arise from the inconclusiveness of those first wrought. When Moses' serpent swallowed those of the magicians, the point in controversy, the superiority of Israel's God, was decisively determined. The almost inhuman hardness of Pharaoh's heart, his unbounded selfishness, his avarice, his love of power, his tyrannical disposition, above all, the judicial

blindness with which God, for the punishment of his sins, had visited him, furnished an occasion for such multiplications of divine power as did at one and the same time rebuke Egypt for its idolatry, deliver Israel from their bondage, and declare the name of Jehovah throughout all the earth.

The pivotal point of the present discussion remains to be mentioned. The deeds done by the hand of Moses are such in themselves that deception or mistake of any kind or degree in respect to

the efficient agent by which they were done is not possible. The common-sense of mankind with or without culture in science, skill in logic, or reading in history; ability to form a correct judgment in any matter where the judgment is called into exercise, whether cultivated by educational advantages or left to the spontaneous natural processes of untutored thought, must, in every case, affirm that such works are works which no man can do except God be with him. The difficulty in the case is

But this difficulty aside, we affirm that the whole record taken into account, all the works wrought by the hand of Moses being taken in the aggregate, the three instances named included, and in addition the plagues of lice, of flies, of boils, and blains, of hail, of locusts, of darkness, and especially the death of the first born, the supposition that they were the works of an impostor or of an enthusiast, of a person deceiving or deceived, is simply preposterous. That God was there, that almighty power was

exerted on that occasion, is fully evinced.

No rationalistic interpretation can explain the fact that while other parts of Egypt were overspread with plagues the land of Goshen where the Jews resided, escaped. No epidemic or natural disease did ever result in the death of one in every house throughout the land the same night, and that one the first born of the family; nor can it be rationally supposed that such a thing could take place without a special

any opposite supposition? It is of no avail to say that the waters were divided "by a strong east wind all the night," unless it can be shown, which cannot be, that a natural wind will produce such a result. Though wind were employed as an instrument it evidently required a divine agency to give the wind proper direction, strength, and time of coming and continuance. If we suppose that the sea was made fordable by an upheaval from a submarine earthquake, no matter, for the supposition postulates

Thou stretchedst out thy right hand, the earth swallowed them.

Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed, thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation."

The passage over Jordan belongs to the same category as that of the Red Sea, and the same rules of criticism apply to each.

The one evinces the special in coming of divine power as evidently as the other. The primary purpose of

shall let your children know, saying, Israel came over this Jordan on dry land. For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red Sea, which he dried up before us, until we were gone over; that all the people of the earth might know the hand of the Lord, that it is mighty: that ye might fear the Lord your God forever." The dividing of the waters was foretold. "And it shall Come to pass as soon as the priests that bear the ark of the Lord,

question of Christian evidences is determined. At the expense, therefore of some repetition we inquire specifically, Is this passage genuine? Is it authentic?

The only interpretation discounting or diminishing its determinative force, having sufficient plausibility to be deserving of notice, is of the rationalistic type. It may be said the passage of Jordan was a difficult exploit; its banks were overflowed, the stream was rapid. For a multitude of people of all ages, with all their effects,

to pass over such a stream, at such a time, without bridge or shipping, could not be accomplished without great effort and great peril. They did, however, pass safely and with remarkable facility. They accomplished what seemed to themselves well nigh impossible; they were wonderfully fortunate. It was a great event effected with almost marvelous success; it seemed very like to a special interference of divine providence. Now, to a people recognizing a superintending providence, in all the vicissitudes of life,

for daily food, the water from the smitten rock, the fiery serpents, the Shekinah in the holy of holies, the thunders and lightnings of Sinai, from out of which God gave to Moses the law and the testimonies, and the cloud of glory covering the mount and ofttimes filling the tent of the tabernacle.

NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLES.

The resurrection of our Lord from the dead is the leading and crowning miracle of New Testament history; if it be without

doubt and beyond question a veritable fact, it carries with it the whole history as recorded in the Gospels and the Acts, and as illustrated in the Epistles.

That Jesus actually died was never questioned in the ancient times. The soldiers, when they came to hasten death by the breaking of bones, were fully satisfied that Jesus was already dead; the multitude were satisfied and dispersed; the chief priest and the Sanhedrim were satisfied; Pilate credited the report, and

unmitigated bereavement; the body of Jesus lies alone in the region of the dead; the Jewish Sabbath, with its solemn ceremonies and symbolic sacrifices, according to legal requirement and social custom, is carefully observed; the friends of Jesus are but slightly if at all interested in the accustomed devotions because of their great sorrow, and the enemies of Jesus are alike indifferent to altar, to sacrifice, and to ceremony, because of their great joy in having triumphantly overcome

incredible, since they were stationed at the sepulcher under the penalty of death to prevent that very thing, and besides, they affirm that it took place while they were asleep. That their report was not credited either by priests or people is evidenced by the fact that at no time when the apostles were arraigned before the courts for preaching Christ and the resurrection, though in the presence of the courts themselves they boldly affirmed that Christ, whom the elders of the people had crucified, was indeed risen

from the dead, they were never confronted with this story of the Roman soldiers. The fact was, this report was instantly dropped as an extemporized resort of the priests when in the emergency they had no other subterfuge in which they might hope for protection. We have, then, no other theory for the final disposition of our Lord's body but that of the resurrection, and no other testimony but that of the apostles.

The disciples were not idiots nor insane persons, nor were they fanatics. They not only had opportunity to know of the facts to which they testified, but they also were men of sound common sense, capable of judging of the facts they witnessed.

The rationalist, who denies all supernatural endowment, judging from what the apostles accomplished in their subsequent lives, and from the effects of their deeds as evinced during all the centuries since, and as now

enthusiasm can have no power to misconstrue, when apostolic testimony on such subjects is under discussion, modern rationalism every time avers that because of the imperfections of the apostles, their weakness as men, and especially their zeal for their cause, they must be expected to equivocate, to resort to mythological constructions, and to state facts in such a way as in their weak and partial judgments would be most favorable to their cause. That is to say, the apostles,

after all, though good men, are not reliable witnesses; in plain language, they are dishonest men, false witnesses.

The integrity of the apostles is sufficiently evidenced by the facts just now alluded to. This has been a chief point of attack for centuries. Opponents have exhausted their resources, every possible method of warfare has been resorted to, all that scientific, philosophic, legal, and philological investigations can do has been done to destroy public

representation in any manner or degree.

But, lastly, the circumstances of the case furnish no motive for misrepresentation. They had no interest prompting them to make a false report. They were disinterested witnesses. We have seen that they possessed opportunity, discernment, and integrity, and now we add this last element of credibility—disinterestedness.

It is sometimes alleged that the disciples of Christ having been induced from

promoted by Christ's appointment to the office of apostleship, their love of notoriety was sufficient to prompt the deceptions charged against them. To ascribe either or both of these or any similar motives as incentives inducing them to assert what they knew to be false, and thus impose upon mankind, as a religion, that which they knew to be a fraud and a deception, is to affirm that they were the weakest and wickedest of men. To affirm that while they knew that the supernatural is totally

the straitest and most popular of the sects of the Jewish religion. His natural endowments, as evinced by his subsequent life, were extraordinary; his consequent literary fame and religious reputation, secured for him, when yet a youth, promotion in civil life; he, as a member of the execution staff, held the clothes of those that stoned Stephen; he afterwards received a commission under the authority of the emperor and with the sanction of the high-priests and the Sanhedrim to go to

Damascus with power affecting life and limb.

Suddenly his literary fame, his religious reputation, his civil prospects became as nothing in his estimation. He abandons relatives, friends, neighbors, and acquaintances, all the associations of his domestic, social, literary, civil, and religious life. He goes from city to city, from continent to continent, in labors abundant by night and by day, preaching Christ and him crucified, with the doctrine of the resurrection and hope of

credible witnesses will reject that of thirteen, and thirteen thousand as well. The case is a case of evidence, and evidence complete is complete. The testimony of twelve men to the fact of having seen and heard and handled a living person, confirmed by the testimony of five hundred others, sustained by all the circumstantial evidence known to bear upon the case is sufficient for a verdict that will infallibly correspond with the truth.

The Bible as a history is as reliable as any history

CHAPTER 3: ARGUMENT SECOND: PROPHECY.

He that revealeth secrets maketh known to thee what shall come to pass. I have told you before it come to pass that when it is come to pass ye might believe. Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob.

Let them bring them forth and show us what shall happen, or declare unto us things to come."

OBJECTIONS.

The antecedent objections to the argument from prophecy usually put forth are of but little weight, and yet they may be deemed by some worthy of at least a brief reply.

The most common is on this wise: All future events are either necessary or contingent; if necessary, they are made so by the present existence of the causes which will produce them; therefore, their foresight is possible to a wise calculation, and they may be foretold without

illustrations of future history.

But, these aside, there remain instances abundant, for the argument, of plain prophecies with obvious fulfillments.

DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE FOUR GREAT KINGDOMS.

Daniel lived six hundred years before Christ; the book bearing his name was written by him, as is evident from the frequent use of the first person. The prophecies it contains were

commentaries foreshadows the mutual relations of Church and State as they are to be from henceforth to the end of time.

Nebuchadnezzar in a dream saw a colossal metallic statue standing in the midst of an extended plain. The head thereof was of gold, its breast and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of brass, its legs of iron, and its feet part of iron and part of clay. From a distant mountain, without any visible agency, a stone was severed; it moved in the direction of

the image, smote it, dashed it in pieces, ground it to powder, and the image was scattered by the winds of heaven; the stone became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.

According to the interpretation the head of gold represented the Babylonian Empire, then existent and supreme among the governments of the earth. The other parts of the image represented three other governments, which were to possess universal jurisdiction. They were to follow in

divine kingdom, represented by the "stone cut out of the mountain without hands," was to appear, prosper, overcome all opposition, and itself become universal and perpetual. This was professedly a foretelling of future events. The king, as kings in his circumstances are wont to do, was anxiously inquiring in his own mind what was probable as to the succession of his government, who should succeed him, what state of things should subsist, "what should come to pass

hereafter." He thought of these things during his waking hours in bed, and dreamed of them when he fell asleep. The prophet assured him that He that revealeth secrets had made known to him in his dream what he was so anxious to know.

The interpretation, without which the dream, itself was of no value, was, as the prophet claimed, a revelation directly from God to himself. "As for me this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living."

"The wise men, the astrologers, the magicians, the soothsayers" cannot reveal it;

"but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets;" and he "maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days."

The fulfillment of this prophecy is plain and obvious to the most cursory reading of the history of the world. The Babylonian king was acknowledged as king of kings; his empire was supreme.

PROPHECIES RESPECTING THE JEWS.

The prophecy of Moses concerning the people of Israel, recorded in the twenty-sixth of Leviticus, and in the twenty-eighth of Deuteronomy, appears in the form of blessings promised on condition of obedience, and of judgments threatened in case of transgression. But in these threatenings there is a minuteness and a detail in the descriptions which evince more than a general apprehension of such

calamities as usually in the providence of God fall upon transgressors. The descriptions of the curses which would visit them if they did not hearken unto the voice of the Lord their God are so circumstantial and definite that they can be regarded in no other light than that of a prophetic announcement of what would take place in their particular history. It is said: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth as swift as the eagle's flight; a nation whose tongue thou shalt

Among the prophecies respecting the Jews, those referring to their preservation, notwithstanding and in spite of their extremities, deserve special attention and study. The Old Testament in many ways teaches that God hath not wholly cast away his people, hath not forgotten his covenant with Abraham, but hath preserved a remnant and will preserve them for some future visitations of grace and mercy. The New Testament also affirms the same thing—"blindness in

an ecclesiastical establishment, without legislation, without courts of justice, without marts of trade, destitute of everything that constitutes a nation, persecuted, despised, treated with all forms of oppression, cruelty, wrong, injustice, and indignity, they nevertheless exist in the world as a distinct people. In a word, for three thousand years they have survived against all conceivable odds; it was foretold they would so survive. What but Omnipotence could have so

preserved them? and what but Omniscience could have certainly foretold that they would be so preserved? These prophecies evidence that what they say, God says, and they prove conclusively that the books in which they are found have indisputable claims to a divine authorship.

THE PROPHECIES CONCERNING CHRIST.

These with their fulfillment constitute the theme of the Sacred Scriptures from the commencement in the

Apocalypse exhibits his triumphs and the glory which is to follow. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." It was prophesied that he should be of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David; that his coming should be heralded by a forerunner who should be "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight;" that he should be born of a virgin in Bethlehem of Judea, four hundred and ninety years after the going forth of the commandment to

conclusively a divine authorship. What the Old Testament says about Christ, God said prophetically; what the New Testament says about Christ, God says historically.

CHAPTER 4: ARGUMENT THIRD: INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES.

It is common in works on Apologetics to speak of the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Authors differ

unusual to address argument in support of each of these separately; and this is well, since a book may be genuine and not authentic; it may have been written by the person it claims as author, and yet its subject-matter be false. It may be authentic and yet not genuine; its general affirmations may be true and yet claim an author not its own. It may be both genuine and authentic but not inspired.

These remarks are applicable to books in general, but in the case of

and yet of sufficient importance to deserve attention. The more important evidences of this class are the marvelous diffusions of Christianity during the first three centuries, and the actual beneficial effects of Christianity upon mankind.

Evidences are again divided into two classes, rational and authenticating. These may be distinguished most readily by observing the point to be proved. Rational evidence is that

which is adduced to show that the doctrine taught is true. It consists of those considerations in the light of which we are induced to believe in the truth of the proposition discussed.

Authenticating evidence is adduced to prove that the teacher is divinely commissioned. It may have no natural connection with the doctrine taught, may be foreign to it. Rational evidence shows reasons why the proposition is true, or why it must be true. Authenticating evidence

shows reasons why we should believe it is true.

This distinction may be of service in the discussion of modern rationalism. This issue affirms that a rational being cannot be required to believe any doctrine or to practice any precept, unless he has good reason for so doing, which affirmation may be readily accepted as a moral axiom. The error of the rationalists consists in this, that they always demand rational evidences for belief or practice; they require to see why the thing is;

belief in the doctrine taught.

The topics of discussion in Systematic Divinity are sometimes divided into two divisions, the one called Natural Religion and the other Revealed Religion. The term natural religion is ambiguous. It is sometimes used to designate that system of morals and religion, or those moral and religious truths, which the unaided reason of man is competent to discover by the light of nature and providence. At other times it is used to designate that

system of morals and religion which comprises all those moral and religious truths, whose rational evidence being adequate, the human mind is competent to apprehend.

The first of these definitions we think, for the following reasons, should be laid aside as useless. First, it has been through all the ages and still is the source of a fruitless controversy. On the one hand, it is said that it may be reasonably doubted whether there is any such thing as natural

religion, whether, indeed, that idea fundamental to all religion, the idea of God, in even its most embryonic state, was ever in any case purely a discovery by natural means. It is affirmed that history does not furnish any instance wherein any individual family, tribe, or nation, known to be destitute of all knowledge of morals and religion at the start, have of their own motion, without aid or instruction from others, arisen from barbarism to civilization.

conceding that a pure theism is conceivably a possible attainment to the natural man by merely natural means, yet all the arguments usually adduced in treatises on ethics and religion to prove the necessity of a revelation from the defects of natural religion are, valid for the purpose for which they are adduced, because whatever man might be, he never was, and it is reasonable to infer he never will be, such, but that a revelation is indispensable to his highest good.

Third, this definition should be laid aside, because the question of man's natural ability to discover religious truths, whatever it might have been in past times, is in our day wholly nugatory. To the present generation of readers and thinkers, with a knowledge of many religions, religions that have a history extending over thousands of years; taught this knowledge earlier than they can remember; interested in it through all the days of their earthly life; called to its investigation by all the

evidence being adequate, the human mind is competent to apprehend. With this definition the terms natural religion and revealed religion constitute an exhaustive category to which all known moral and religious truths may be referred, and the distinction between rational and authenticating evidence forms a basis of classification distinct and intelligible.

The truths of natural religion are believed, because the believer apprehends that which

revealed religion belong the doctrines of the trinity, divinity of Christ, the hypostatic union, the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, the atonement, justification by faith only, supernatural agency in the regeneration and sanctification of the believer, the witness of the Spirit to adoption and heirship, and the resurrection of the dead.

There is one other classification of Christian evidences not yet mentioned. The arguments showing the necessity of a

arguments from miracles and prophecy are of indispensable value to the Christian system, since they constitute the authenticating evidences on which are grounded all beliefs in the doctrines placed in the category of revealed religion. Whatever distinguishes Christianity from pure theism has its basis here. Faith in the trinity and its cognate doctrines must be founded on an unquestionable "thus saith the Lord," or it is a mere superstition. It is also obvious that much of Bible instruction may be shown

to be true independent of the miraculous and the supernatural. The doctrines placed in the category of natural religion may be fully sustained by rational evidences. It may be further remarked, that a proper presentation of this class of evidences will avail not only to show that those doctrines of the Holy Scriptures on which they have a bearing are true, but also that natural religion is taught in the Bible with a perspicuity and strength of statement, a beauty of illustration and persuasiveness of motive

argument third, next demands attention.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

I. Certain Bible doctrines are of the nature of intuitive truths.

1. The Bible, wherever it directly asserts or makes indirect reference to the subject, refers the existence, preservation, and phenomena of the universe to an intelligent person as first cause of all that is: to God, first and last, beginning and end, infinite in all possible perfections. In so doing it

natural theology of the Bible—the science of the Bible as to the being of God—then, is such that it is intuitively accepted as truthful; and more than this, the Biblical theology so far transcends all other treatises, philosophies, discussions, respecting the Divine Being, that its very style or manner of treatment, its perspicuity and strength of statement, its beauty and sublimity of thought, evinces the authorship or inspiration of him who only can know God to perfection.

is endowed with executive efficiency, or, in other words, the human will is an alternative power; is capable of making a selection of one from several different things or courses of conduct; it is also an executive power, is capable of putting forth a mental *nisus* which is causal to muscular movements. The system of morals and religion taught in the Bible, in all its parts and in its whole, teaches or implies, or both, that because of this endowment of free will, because of this feature of the divine image

in which man was created, "because of this characteristic of the human constitution, man is held responsible to his Maker for his conduct. Every "thou shalt," and "thou shalt not" recorded in the Bible implies this; without this the thundering voices and the flashing lightnings of Mount Sinai have no meaning, the threatened judgments of woe and eternal death have in them nothing fearful. The agony of Gethsemane, the cross and passion of Calvary have no relation to human conduct, character or

world that is without end. What is thus set forth with such clearness and prominence as of such vast and momentous importance, is recognized in universal consciousness as a truth not requiring argument, not to be determined by discussion. Though this fundamental thought when carried into the processes of psychological investigation is inseparably connected with the difficult problems of free knowledge and fate, though everyone finds herein problems for whose solution he is incompetent,

annihilation ever take place, or if ever consciousness die, it will be a judgment or penalty inflicted upon him who has proved himself unworthy of an immortality to which he had been invited.

The image of God, in which man was created, includes among its features the possibility of unending existence. This truth needs only illustration and enforcement, the conviction that it is a truth does not depend either upon argument or authority. The ancient

philosophers indeed
discoursed of man's future
argumentatively. They
seemed to conceive that
whether there be an
hereafter was to be
determined by reasoning.
But their arguments of this
kind were sophisms. They
were so of necessity, for no
conviction of the human
mind is more simple,
elementary, better known
than this; as a logician
would say, there is no
middle term with which the
ideas of man and
immortality may be so
compared as to construct a
conclusive argument. The

certainly not attainable by any other means. "*We know* that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens."

Eternity to finite thought is an unfathomable void; here are heights without a summit, depths without a bottom, lengths and breadths without limits of extension. Would mere human philosophy ascend these heights? She soars at best but on conjecture's trembling wing; doubt,

characterizes the Christian's faith in the hereafter, that we do not hesitate to affirm that he has been with and learned of Him who only hath immortality. The Scripture testimony concerning the life to come commends itself not only as deserving of confidence on rational grounds, but also as so eminently superior to human wisdom as to evince that the teachers whose testimony it is are teachers sent from God.

5. The fifth doctrine, and last to be mentioned in this

All do not believe it, but none can confidently disbelieve. To affirm that the future of a vicious man will be the same as though he had been virtuous is as impossible as to affirm that he will have no future; or to affirm that the virtue of a good man will be of no advantage to him in the far off of the beyond is as impossible as to affirm that vice is virtue, or that there is no difference between them. But however clear it may be in the light of thought that expectations of a future adjustment are well founded, yet this

teachings which are to our vision a rainbow, of hope spanning the dark cloud of our future prospects, or a glorious shining forth of the light of knowledge upon the darkness of our ignorance from the regions of truth and certainty, must be of those whom, choosing darkness rather than light, the god of this world hath blinded, lest the light of the glorious Gospel should shine unto them.

Having thus enumerated several of the fundamental doctrines of religion assumed, illustrated, and

enforced in the holy writings—doctrines which commend themselves to thought without argument on mere announcement, independent of authorities and authenticating evidences, having characteristics of intuitive truths—attention is called to a second class of Scripture doctrines which, when properly considered, are of the nature of internal evidences.

II. Several prominent doctrines of the Bible are statements of obvious facts—facts in the

God a liar." "All we like sheep have gone astray." "They have done abominable works; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Corresponding with these declarations, the universal verdict of mankind, each with respect to himself and his neighbor and all his race, is that in some respects, to some extent, some more and some less, all mankind are sinners. Doubtless our judgments are in this respect, as in others, imperfect, and oftentimes

at fault. Some men censure themselves for what they could not avoid; some entertain an opinion respecting the general conduct and character of mankind that estimates men worse than they really are; others think more highly of men than they ought to think; but all are agreed that all are sinners. The only exception is the atheistic fatalist, who, without doubt, entertains his fatalistic notions in opposition to, and in spite of, a strong conviction to the contrary. What, then, is affirmed in Scripture of the

religion to furnish assurances of pardon is applicable here, and may be referred to, but need not be repeated. If the atonement of the Scriptures be not the divinely provided remedy for the evils of sin, then we aver man has no knowledge of any adequate remedy; life is an inexplicable mystery, and death a leap into darkness. By so much, then, as sin is an acknowledged fact, pardon a requisite indispensable to peace, happiness, and well-being, and atonement an

indeed can be." "We all are as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags, and we all do fade as a leaf, and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away." "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things ye would." "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." "The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."

great bar to happiness here and to good prospects in the hereafter. The great want, then, of our common humanity is some regenerating agency that shall create us anew. "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?"

The Bible doctrine of depravity and the consequent need of a new creation is, then, a statement of a well-known and acknowledged fact and a clearly recognized want of our common nature; and the correlated doctrine of

regeneration is an adequate and sole provision for that felt and acknowledged necessity. The statement of the facts needs no authentication—whether a divine, a supernatural agency is ever given, or will be given to regenerate mankind; if given, under what circumstances, on what conditions, is matter of revelation—knowledge on that subject must depend upon testimony; testimony claiming divine authority must be authenticated by divine works. The doctrine of regeneration, as the

on these subjects, God says.

3. Again, man is ignorant, and requires knowledge; weak, and requires strength; a child of sorrow, and needs comfort.

Correlated to these facts and wants is the Bible doctrine of a divine Spirit who is a teacher, supernaturally enlightening the eyes of the understanding, solving doubts, leading into all needful truth; who is a Spirit of grace, strengthening feeble purposes, giving energy to

authenticating evidence, nevertheless are such as may be properly referred to under the head of internal evidences.

III. The outline historical events recorded in the Bible are such as carry with them *prima facie* evidence of their own authenticity. This has been so fully shown under the head of miracles that but little needs to be said in this connection.

The genealogy of the Jewish nation from Abraham their founder downward; the primal

residence in Palestine, the emigration into Egypt in the time of Jacob, the prosperity under Joseph, the subsequent reduction to a condition of servitude and sorrow, the exodus under the leadership of Moses; the preservation, protection, and guidance in and through the wilderness, with the wonderful and miraculous events attending, the conquest of Canaan, and the division and settlements of the lands of Palestine; the wars offensive and defensive, occurring through years of

inspiration of God. To this let us add under the same head of internal evidence a fourth consideration.

IV. The language, the literature, the allusions to customs, to contemporary events, topographical descriptions, the biographical sketches, all that the Bible contains of the nature of circumstantial evidences, are precisely such as its history and its claims require. The full development of this thought would require volumes, a complete

time to time, so that writers of one age differ greatly from those of another; as no one living in the days of Demosthenes could have written as Homer did, so was it impossible for Malachi or David to write as did Moses. The different styles of the several books conform precisely to what they would be if, as claimed for them, they were composed at different times by authors living in ages different and distant from each other. It is evident from the style and character of the language

of the Pentateuch, that no man living much later than Moses could have written it, and also from that of the Prophecy of Malachi, that it could not have been written much earlier than it claims to have been written. The style and characteristics of the Psalms of David correspond with the peculiarities of David's mind and the times in which David lived. The same is true of the Prophecy of Isaiah, and in fine of all the ancient Scriptures. The New Testament was written in

credible, and therefore inspired.

In reference to the correctness of these allusions, it is sufficient to say that criticism never more severe—criticism in the hands both of enemies and of friends than whom none were ever more learned—criticism continued through centuries—has done on this very question its very best, and as yet no case of unquestionable error has appeared—no case of obscure or doubtful reference, inconsistent

with the perfect integrity and credibility of the sacred writers, has been shown. On the contrary, the testimony of contemporary writers, especially of Josephus, is in many cases confirmatory, never clearly antagonistic. Allusions to other matters—as to the private and public character of men in power, to the religious, ecclesiastical, and political prejudices of the people, the dispersed condition of the Jews, the existence of synagogues frequently built by riversides in nearly all the

heathen cities visited by the apostles—in fine, all the references, to whatever subject they are made, are found to be in accordance with, and are never contradicted by what is found on the same subjects in contemporary histories.

A case of special interest, and lucidly demonstrative of the Christian faith, is the account given in the Acts of the Apostles of the travels of St. Paul through Asia Minor and Greece, and of his labors persecutions, and successes in the cities where he preached the

Gospel. Conybeare and Howson will greatly aid an appreciation of this case. We see Athens as it was—the common people, the religionists, and especially the philosophers as they were; the whole scene is life-like; we seem to be there, and on Mars' Hill hear for ourselves the inspired discourse on the spirituality and eternity of God. All the incidental and local allusions are in such perfect parallelism with well-known Grecian history, that we know thereby that the writer was a companion of the apostle.

highest good, a violation of natural or acquired rights, and, in justice and righteousness, ought to be avoided.

4. That the perspicuity, strength, harmony, beauty, universality, applicability, and solemn sanction with which these doctrines and duties are set forth, the superiority of the Scriptures in these and all other valuable regards to all that mere human genius has ever attained in its efforts to illustrate these themes, constitute a strong presumption that the

sacred writers were divinely inspired.

5. That the outline of prominent events of Scripture history are of such a nature that the *prima facie* evidence is sufficient to establish their authenticity, and that the connection between them and other recorded events is so inseparable that the authenticity of the former carries with it the authenticity of the whole.

6. That the incidental and circumstantial allusions and references of the Scriptures to contemporary

OBJECTION FROM ABSURDITY.

It is objected that the Bible teaches absurdities; and the alleged absurdity chiefly depended upon to sustain this position is the doctrine of the Trinity. Of course, the objector finds this doctrine in the Book, and he is sustained in the opinion that a divine trinity is a Bible doctrine by the fact that a very large majority of Christian believers in all the ages of the Christian era have so believed. Moreover the objector and the whole

mathematical absurdity, and therefore cannot be believed if it be affirmed of the same thing in the same sense. That three gods are one god, or that three persons are one person, cannot be true; but neither does the Bible nor the Church so state the doctrine of the trinity. The formulas of the Scriptures and the Church creeds affirm that the Eternal One subsists in a manner that admits of a personal distinction, I, thou, he. The doctrine is an affirmation as to the *quo modo*, or manner of the divine

fact that it does so teach is no bar to its reception as a divine word.

OBJECTION FROM MYSTERY.

Again, as an objection to the force of the argument from internal evidence it is alleged that the Bible teaches mysteries; and though these do not prove it false, as would an absurdity, they prove it useless, and therefore not a revelation from God for man's moral and religious benefit. It is affirmed that such ideas as three persons in one substance, the idea

OBJECTION FROM ERROR.

It is affirmed that the Bible teaches what is erroneous, which, if true, proves conclusively that its writers were not inspired, and that therefore it cannot be maintained that what the Bible says, God says. In our times the effort to sustain this objection most frequently made and having most influence in public opinion, has respect to the Bible testimony concerning the creation of the world and of man.

To show that the sacred writers when writing the Scriptures, as other men, and as they themselves at other times, were subject to errors in judgment and opinion, and that the books written contain those errors, it is asserted that the apostles believed that the second coming of Christ and the end of the world would transpire before the generation then living had all passed away, and that they have said so in their Epistles. That the apostles did so believe may be admitted, but that they have so said in the

canonical Scriptures is denied; contrariwise, they affirm that

“of that day and of that hour knoweth no man.”

Herein we have, if not an evidence of divine supervision, an evidence of apostolic candor and caution. They believed that some of them would never die, but be instantly changed and caught up to live with Christ and God in heaven; and yet though they so believed, they never so said.

OBJECTION FROM DEFECT.

It is objected to the Bible as the Word of God that it contains many contradictions and discrepancies; that in ancient manuscripts there are numerous various readings, and that its language and style is frequently vulgar, coarse, and corrupting.

These objections are all of them, in one form or another, ancient and threadbare—now obsolete, because shown to be baseless, and now again

revived with the airs of discovery, put forth with loud acclain as triumphant victors, and again left to ignominious burial. Most of them are trivial and captious, and spring from the ignorance of the objector; they appear to the superficial as real defects, but a little careful study suffices to dissipate the appearance.

The perfect adjustment of all the parts of such a book as the Bible, so that there should be no difficulties in a perfect apprehension of its contents, so that

adverse criticism were impossible, so that all were plain and obvious without doubt or difficulty, is what no intelligent man, whatever his opinion of the Book itself may be, will demand or expect. All topics of human thought have their difficulties, all sciences have their exceptional cases. In all that pertains to man in his life under the sun, there are fundamental principles; general laws, outlines, forms, most of them scientifically formulated and recognized as known truths—truths established

discrepancy and to a more perfect science.

Manifestly a perfect adjustment requires perfect knowledge. Not until we know all things can we see all truth to be perfectly harmonious with itself. Apply this obvious principle to Biblical interpretation and all the objections now before us will disappear.

That there is even one case of unqualified contradiction is denied; discussion on that point, of course, awaits the production of proof. That

and recorded for different purposes, will be differently described, will also explain other discrepancies."

The chronology of the life of Christ cannot be satisfactorily made out. The same events are recorded in the different Gospels in a different order. This is to be accounted for by the obvious fact that neither of the Gospels has the character of a diary; they are not biographies, they are simply memoirs—records of memorable

repulsive at another would be quite the opposite.

OBJECTION FROM OBSCURITY.

Perhaps among the objections not formulated by scientific writers, but having extensive influence with the common mind, may be reckoned one we shall call the objection from obscurity.

There are, it is alleged, enveloping the subject of religion as taught in the Bible and by its defenders, perplexing obscurities.

universal acceptance. But there is no religion compelling universal acceptance; therefore, the true religion does not involve momentous truths and important interests. The Christian religion does involve momentous truths and important interests; therefore, it is not the true religion. The arguments are conclusive; but both conclusions are false, because the first premise is false.

It is not certain that all important truths will command universal

same as just now discussed, sometimes takes on another form. Not only rationalistic minds allege this objection, but also the superstitious. These require a sign, a specific revelation to them personally, a miracle wrought for their special benefit, to demonstrate to them that the word spoken or written is indeed the word of God. The Bible, say they, is written in common human language; the peculiarities of mental constitution and educational prejudice in the writers are plainly

evinced by the turn of thought and style of writing; its preachers are but men of like passions with other men; the whole matter seems human. Let God speak—let a voice from heaven say

“This is my book, seek ye out of the Scripture and learn my will;” or “This is my servant, my son, hear ye him.” Let God speak and we will listen, learn and obey. This is evidently a requirement scarcely deserving a reply, yet let it suffice to say, whatever may be said of it, it is a

morality or religion; their office is indirect.

Morality and piety consist in a voluntary obedience to recognized authority; miracles authenticate the authority, but do not produce, nor even tend to produce, the obedience; they excite wonder, but not love; they astonish, overwhelm, subdue it may be, but they do not convert. Lastly, the objection is not honestly made. Let God speak, says the objector, and I will obey. God has spoken, and is still speaking with unnumbered

voices—voices of commanding eloquence—and still obedience is refused. Men do not obey all that is evidently divine. Most men habitually, all men sometimes, neglect what they know, or may and ought to know, is the will of God concerning them.

All the objections urged against the Christian religion are alleged objections to the Bible, and might therefore be classed with those just above noticed as bearing upon the argument from internal

excellencies will be by them admitted as such. Its superiority over all other treatises on the same subjects will be regarded as a strong intimation that its origin is higher than human, and will at least commend it as the most authoritative rule of faith and practice in man's possession in the form of a book. To the thought of the present writer, the argument from internal evidence is conclusive. Take the Bible for what it evidently in itself is, with all the difficulties of interpretation, with the

mysteries connected with and suggested by its teachings, with the doubts and uncertainties necessarily attendant upon even its most careful study, it so fully harmonizes with all known truths, it is so wisely, wonderfully, and efficiently adapted to produce the highest good of which man has any knowledge, that the conclusion seems resistless that it is divinely given as man's authoritative rule of faith and practice. It is not intended to disparage the value of other evidences; Christianity could not do

without them, God has not wrought miracles and uttered prophecies in vain; but, as we see it, the book itself bears sufficient and satisfactory evidences of its divinity. We advance to Argument Fourth.

CHAPTER 5: ARGUMENT FOURTH: COLLATERAL EVIDENCES.

“Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel: according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and Israel, What hath God

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

IN what follows, an argument for the divinity of religion is not distinguished from an argument for the inspiration of the Scripture; the Bible and the religion it teaches are inseparable.

This seems, therefore, a fitting place to say a word on the theories of inspiration. What is intended by the term? in what sense were the writers of, the Scriptures inspired? On this subject great

conceive of the divine and the human agencies as cooperating, interpenetrating so that the greater the divine the greater the human. and the less the divine the less the human.

This latter conception is by far the preferable—indeed, it seems axiomatic—it is in harmony with the Christian idea of man living, moving, and having his being in God. The work of religion is evidently a result from the co-operation of the divine and the human agencies. Man is a worker

elevated, quickened, strengthened, so that old truths are more clearly conceived. All the mental faculties are under a divine influence, elevated, quickened, strengthened, inspired, so that religious truths are conceived and formulated as the unaided reason of man could never conceive and state them. Thus a knowledge of the true religion becomes a possession of the human mind; it is embodied in forms of speech, in historic events, in religious institutions, in forms of

worship, in rites and ceremonies.

For the benefit of succeeding generations, the religion thus made known and embodied is committed to writing. There may be many to whom it may seem good to set forth in order a declaration of those things which they most surely believe." By a providential supervision and direction it is brought to pass that among all that is written, a full and complete exponent and declaration of the truth is published to the world,

The view of the doctrine of inspiration herein taken, then, is briefly that the divine agency has been so employed in the production of the Bible that it has come to pass, that we have here a divinely given book; that it furnishes all the moral and religious information needful for all the purposes of the present life; that it is pure from any admixture with error and is an authoritative rule of faith and practice. This Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for

says. An argument for the divinity of the Christian religion is an argument for the divinity of the Bible.

1. Among the class of evidences commonly called collateral, the success of the Gospel during the first three hundred years of Christian history holds a prominent place. The argument is oft repeated and familiar, the case is clear and requires but a brief statement. The Christian religion commences its history with the missionary labors of twelve men. These are men

of but ordinary natural endowments, with the educational advantages of common life; they are mostly fishermen, changing their avocations and entering upon public life in the maturity of their years; they are Jews, and as such are held in low esteem by the people among whom most of their labors are expended. Their labor consisted chiefly, nay exclusively, in repeating, wherever they could obtain hearers, in synagogues, in market-places, in schools of learning, in private dwellings, by the wayside,

as a fiction of their own invention, repeated without art or eloquence, and without a knowledge of the language of the people they addressed (for the apostles were unlearned men at mature age, and had no opportunity to acquire a knowledge of foreign language, and dialects) were citizens of the most renowned cities of the then known world, educated under the influence of the age next succeeding the Augustan Age, justly celebrated as that of the most distinguished classical

dying for their lies; deceivers do not preach against deception for the sake of dying in support of deception. The sufferings and inflictions through which the apostles preached the Gospel are proofs positive that they believed what they preached, and that they did so not from any personal motive, but in obedience to a divine command.

Hanging about the question of success we have, then, these probabilities: (1.) That without supernatural

interposition the preaching of the Gospel, for several years, at least, immediately succeeding the death of Christ until converts could be raised up and trained in the knowledge of foreign tongues, would be restricted within the narrow limits of those people who understood the language spoken by unlearned men among the Jews.

(2.) That among the Jews themselves—and if by any means the Gospel could be preached among others among them also—if it

were but an idle story, as it is if not true, it would not be likely to survive its proclamation any appreciable length of time for the want of Interest either In the Gospel itself or any of its accompaniments. (3.) That if by any means an interest was awakened, that interest would be antagonistic, as is evidenced by the facts of the case as they were, and by the magnitude and multitude of interests which the Gospel invaded; and the story being a false and idle tale, supported

became the religion of the empire.

Tertullian, a Christian apologist of the second century, addressing the Proconsul of Africa, says: "If we Christians were disposed to array ourselves as open or secret enemies of our opposers, a sufficient force of numbers is not wanting to us.

Many of the Moors and Marcomanm, as well as other tribes more remote, even to the ends of the earth and throughout the world, are with us. We are but of yesterday, and yet

we have filled all your places, your cities, your islands, your castles, your towns, your council-houses, your very camps, your tribes, your palace, your senate, your forum. We have left you nothing but your temples. If we should break away from you and should remove into some other country, the mere loss of so many citizens would overwhelm your government, and would itself be an effectual punishment. Doubtless you would be frightened at your own solitude. The silence and stupor which you

century, testify with equal clearness to the same thing. The fact is beyond dispute; to account for it on any theory of unbelief is impossible. Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," has made the attempt and utterly failed. The failure of such a one as he, after such an effort as he there puts forth, is full assurance that success need not be expected elsewhere.

The success of the Gospel in the first three centuries of Christian history is reasonably regarded as

idolatries which it supplanted.

2. To the argument from the success attending the promulgation of the Gospel during the first three centuries may be added an argument from the progress of Christianity during all the ages since, especially from its progress and advancement during the last two hundred years. This latter differs from the former in strength and conclusiveness, but has sufficient weight to be deserving of attentive consideration. The

progress of Christianity in the later years of its history does not constitute an argument so decisive and determinative as does success in its beginning. Though differing in degrees of strength, the arguments (with one exception in the points to be proved) are the same in kind. For the inauguration of the Christian system the apostles were specially endowed. They were inspired men in a sense in which none have been inspired since the termination of the apostolic age—inspired to

teach religion
authoritatively as did their
Master; with them their
office ceased, and with it its
special qualifying
endowment.

The argument from
perpetuity and progress,
like the one from primal
success, proves that the
Christian religion is true,
and also that its teachers
though not endowed with
apostolic functions and
qualifications, are
accompanied, sustained,
and aided by the divine
presence and power. The
command to preach the

monotheism, its ethics are the purest in the world; it has, therefore, the natural elements of life and perpetuity. But, if the question be pressed as to its baseless errors, its silly superstitions, what is the prospect of their survival? the most obvious answer, the sole resort and only theory is, that in addition to the conserving influence of the truths with which it is incorporated, having become the religion of the civilized world, its popularity would perpetuate it, the prejudices of education

repel all thoughtful minds from it, and from all with which it might be associated. When Philip said unto Jesus,

"Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us," Jesus answered,

"Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Shew us the Father? . . . Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake." Again, Jesus

among men; and theanthropic Christ became an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. That the disciples of the apostolic age and the Church of patristic times worshiped Christ as God is as clearly established as any historic event. An assumption of such tremendous import, if an assumption merely, it would seem must be rejected by all instantly on announcement; and if, by any factitious furor, popular excitement, extraneous circumstance, the delusion should be

believer, and believing, is saved from his sins. We affirm that no other theory satisfactorily accounts for the history of vital godliness as it has obtained in the world through the instrumentality of Gospel preaching. Admitting this as the theory and only theory of the fact involved is admitting the truth of Christianity; and that admitted, we are warranted in saying that what the Bible says, God says.

The common objection to this argument, whether formulated or not, even in

neighbor with neighbor, in social and commercial interests, cheerfully and cordially did to others as each would that others do to them. Suppose that all legislation was just and equitable, all natural and acquired rights being respected and defended, all courts of justice well versed in the principles of jurisprudence so that all matters of difference in respect to individual, social, and civil rights and obligations would every time be promptly adjusted in a manner honorable and satisfactory. Suppose, in a

proclaim the divine authorship of the religion that gave them birth. The cessation of auguries and soothsayings, the silence of oracles who had for ages peeped and muttered to the delusion of mankind, which immediately succeeded the advent of Jesus Christ, the termination of idolatries wherever the knowledge of Christ becomes appreciable, the restriction of idol worship within the limits of pagan darkness, all clearly demonstrate not only that Christ came to destroy the works of the

devil, but also that at the approach of his presence demons depart.

The influence of the Gospel by its diffusion and defense of the doctrines of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man, upon war, slavery and oppressive governments, constitutes another conclusive argument for its divine authorship. Arbitration was never resorted to by any nations for the settlement of differences judged to be just cause of war, except Christian nations. As the Christian

religion becomes dominant in public opinion and prevalent with officers of government, wars become less frequent, and where they exist their methods are modified, cruelties are eliminated and humanities are multiplied in the systems of warfare and the practices of warriors. Slavery in the Roman Empire was so modified by the diffusion of Christian influences among the people, that it became virtually extinct.

It is lamentably true that slavery, as well as war and

standard of humanity, by the fostering influences of the Christian religion, and by them in a manner, to a degree and extent not attained by any other agency. In nearly all Christian communities the key to all knowledge is within the reach of the poorest and most obscure.

All may, if they will, though of low degree, advance themselves through learning to high attainments, wealth, and dignity.

That Christianity fosters literature and science is

persistent opposers of what is new are ministers of religion? We reply, so ought it to be; especially if the new averment have a bearing upon religion.

Everything new deserves to be persecuted—the interests of truth require it. Antiquity, other things being equal, is *prima facie* evidence of merit, and must not give place to mere novelty. Let new theories be tested; tried by a persistent opposition, and when proved to be true, held fast.

The Christian religion is a preventive of pauperism; it diffuses the means of physical comforts among the masses, equalizes the financial condition of the population, increases the wealth of the nation, and elevates the common style of life.

This it does by making industry and economy not only honorable but also obligatory. It teaches that the use of this world, as not abusing it, is required by divine command—is rewarded not only in this life, but also in the life to

come, and that its opposite will be punished in the retributions of the future world. It teaches that the oppression of the poor is a great offense to God, and that to share with the unfortunate is especially well pleasing to him. God is our common Father, and we be brethren. Any member of the human family upon whom we can confer a benefit is our neighbor, whom we are required to love as we love ourselves. That such principles tend to increase and diffuse wealth, and where not obstructed by

sensuality, or selfishness, do actually increase and diffuse wealth, must be obvious on the slightest reflection.

In respect to whatever is beneficial to mankind, let the whole surface of the earth be examined and different sections compared, and it will be found that the most advanced civilization, the most desirable state of things, is where the Christian religion has most influence. The claim of the Gospel that "godliness is profitable unto all things,

mischievous of all books extant. The argument is conclusive. What is eminently beneficial must be truthful. The Bible is so; therefore, it is what it professes to be—a God-given volume; what it says, God says.

CHAPTER 6: ARGUMENT FIFTH: ARGUMENT FROM EXPERIENCE.

He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself. He that asketh, receiveth. If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine

whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."

THE momentous interests involved in religion warrant an expectation that in some way a conviction of certainty in respect to them is attainable. If man be immortal—if he be a sinner, have transgressed the law of God, and be thus exposed to penalty; if the peril of sin be inconceivably great; if only one way of salvation be

provided; if the present life be at all determinative of destiny in a future state of being—then surely it is reasonable to expect that the end of human existence and the means by which that end may be secured may be certainly known. To suppose that man is made in the image of God, that infinite possibilities are included in the purposes of his creation, that those possibilities are periled by sin, that redemption and salvation are secured only through the death of Deity incarnate, that the benefits and blessings of atonement

But though man be under a necessity of ignorance in respect to some things, of doubt and uncertainty in respect to others, there are some things which he can certainly know; and it is fairly presumable that a competent portion of religious truth lies within the circle of the knowable. Much of religious truth relates directly to personal experience, to matters cognizable in consciousness; and all of the Christian system stands inseparably connected with what more or less directly pertains to Christian

experience. And this experience may be such as of itself to furnish adequate ground for a conviction of certainty not only in respect to the truth and reality of the experience itself, but also in respect to the whole system of truth with which that experience stands connected. The Gospel affirms that if a man will faithfully attend to its directions, observe its requirements, he shall experience a new creation, the eyes of his understanding will be enlightened, his conscience quickened, his heart

the Christian believer has experienced in consciousness a quickening of this sense—such a quickening as is not referable to any natural cause, and is ever attended with a conviction that only the Divine Spirit is adequate to produce such a result. All men have some apprehension of the sinfulness of sin and of the purity of that holiness which God requires in the character and conduct of his intelligent creatures, but he who has not “frustrated the grace of God” sees a darkness in

This persuasion that sin is forgiven, that the criminal before the law is exonerated from obligation to punishment, is accompanied by a conviction of change in other relations. He who had been a prodigal is now returned to his Father's house; he who had been a rebel is now restored to citizenship; he who had been a stranger, an alien, at best a servant, is now a child; and all this arises from, and is founded upon, the testimony of the Divine Spirit bearing witness with, and to, consciousness that

all, after all they can do to soothe a troubled spirit, to relieve the mind of its apprehensions of coming want and coming sorrow, fail to give peace. Until Christian faith and trust ensue, the mind is as "the troubled sea whose waters cannot rest;" but "being justified by faith through our Lord Jesus Christ, we have peace with God" and are at peace with all men; the whole mind is in harmony with the laws of our being; the agitations, anxieties, and disquietudes which make up so large a part of the contents of

former consciousness are consciously absent, and their place is occupied with a fullness of peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Someone has said: "It is the glory of our religion that it has comfort for you." The Spirit promised to believers in Christ is called, par excellence, "the Comforter," "because it is his special office to solace the sorrowing, strengthen the weak, and bind up the broken-hearted.

Christianity proffers to its votaries a victory over the fear of death and a hope of

affirms that though he walk through the valley of the shadow of death he will fear no ill, because "he knows that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The faithful Christian, assured of the reality and certainty of his hopes, says calmly, soberly, confidently, "I have no fear of death. I know that if I die I shall thenceforth be blessed in the kingdom of my Father."

human history should be deceived in such matters, and to such an extent as they must be if the Bible be not inspired, is a supposition that cannot endure for a moment in the light of rational thought. The credibility of the witnesses is unimpeached and unimpeachable. The matters in hand are such as maybe known. The witnesses have had ample opportunity for the acquisition of accurate knowledge. They have no interests inducing misrepresentation; they are persons of known and

CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS.

1. THE Bible is the most ancient of books, and is entitled to respect for its antiquity; it is the only history that reaches back to the commencement of the race; it is as authoritative as any history of ancient times; many of its statements are confirmed by contemporary histories and pagan traditions; in no essential or important particular is it on good authority contradicted; it has been held in high

with Christianity will for a moment allow any other religion (as that of the false prophet, or any of the systems of pagan worship) to come into competition with it. In any case with us, with him who writes and with those who read this book, the choice is between the Christian religion and no religion at all. And yet such a choice is impossible to us, for man is naturally a religious being, and must have some system of religion. Were we to reject Christianity, we should substitute something in its stead; most likely some

immortality; his flesh slumbers in the grave, the resurrection trumpet wakes his dust to life.

(4.) The leading historical events recorded in the Bible are such as carry the evidence of their authenticity with them. The histories of the Jewish nation and of the Christian Church which compose so large a portion of the Sacred Writings are of such a nature, have reference to events of such a character, as that substantial untruthfulness is impossible; rhetorical

Christ is the founder of the Christian religion; he was crucified under the authority of Pontius-Pilate, was dead and buried; the preaching of his resurrection filled the world with believers in him as the Son of God and the Savior of men. Paul was sent to the Gentiles, among whom his ministry was eminently successful; learned Athenians listened to his discourses on the unity and spirituality of God; Jewish Rabbis yielded to his pleas for the common brotherhood of mankind, and multitudes

evidence that God has declared them. The evidences authenticating the Bible as a revelation from God are: (1.) Miracles, or works wrought which no man can do except God be with him, and wrought for the declared purpose of authenticating such a revelation; and (2.) Prophecies uttered at a time and in a manner clearly evincing such a knowledge of the future as no being but God possesses, and accurately fulfilled. That the miracles and prophecies of the Scriptures do furnish full,

come. and are demonstrated in the personal experience of all who submit to its claims.

CHAPTER 8: HISTORIC SKETCH.

THE proof that the Christian religion is the true religion, the evidences that what the Bible says God says, were manifest from the beginning. The apologists saw the proofs on the first announcement of the proposition to be proved. Opposition to Christianity has been substantially the same in all the ages.

revelation and reason, are irreconcilable.

This position of unbelief has constituted the chief standing objection to Christianity in all ages, and apologetics has, for the most part, in all times, been an endeavor of the Christian mind to harmonize faith with science, religion with philosophy.

Occasionally ignorant and vulgar infidels have come to the surface, and for a time engaged attention to some extent by alleging that the Scriptures are self-

contradictory; that
Christianity encourages
immoralities; that it
teaches doctrines
respecting God unworthy
the divine character,—in a
word, that the Christian
religion is in every way a
bad thing. These
allegations are generally
unworthy of a Christian's
notice, but when answered
the answer consists in
showing that the objection
misrepresents the case. The
objector is either ignorant
of the true import of
Scripture; or he
malignantly affirms what
he knows is false. A proper

here to intimate briefly the lines of thought pursued by several apologists whose works have been, and are, deservedly held in high estimation among Christian believers.

Dr. Shedd, in his "History of Doctrines," says that "the earliest defenders of Christianity against heathen skepticism—

Justin Martyr, Tatian, Atheagoras—laid much stress upon the transforming power of Christianity, upon the joyful deaths of Christians, and upon the greater safety

landmarks, and defended the faith in the same manner and spirit as did Augustine and others in more ancient times.

Infidelity, in its modern forms, may be said to have its commencement with English deism. Between the times of Lord Herbert (1748), who propounded a system of theism, or natural religion, rejecting everything characteristic of Christianity, and the times of David Hume (1776), who proposed universal skepticism, every dogma of religion, both natural and

revealed, was disputed. French infidelity and German rationalism followed in train, and from those times to the present Christian faith has measured swords with unbelief in every form of attack and defense known to polemical discussion.

If arguments can be of any avail with atheists, they may be found in Cudworth's "Intellectual System of the Universe," and also in Dr. Samuel Clarke's *a priori* arguments for the existence of God given in the Boylean

Lectures in the years 1704 and 1705.

Atheism is too absurd to be the settled conviction of any man, and though all men find difficulties in holding in mind a strong conviction of the existence of a personal extra-mundane deity, yet but few are able even to persuade themselves that they do really doubt the being of a God. The most formidable antagonist of Christianity is rationalistic theism. It admits the being of God, moral distinctions, human responsibility, and a form

infidels rejected all religion. Hence Bishop Butler, in his "Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature," adopted a line of thought specifically designed and adapted to answer objections. He considered the doctrines of natural and revealed religion, and showed from their analogy to what is known to be true, that it is not improbable that they also are true. For example: from the fact that suffering and misery do exist in this world, we may infer that it

doctrines of Christianity, the "Analogy" exhibits in a masterly way, the whole circle of Christian evidences, and has now, for more than a century, been justly considered a leading and standard work in Christian apologetics.

Paley's "Horae Paulinae" was published in 1790. In this work the coincidences between the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, especially such as clearly evince

"undesignedness," are noticed, and shown to be such as exclude the

supposition of art or contrivance, and thus furnish proof of the truth of these writings, and consequently the truth of Christianity. "The Epistles of Paul" and the Acts of the Apostles mutually strengthen each other's credibility; and Mr.

Paley has shown, in the clearest manner, how one borrows light from the other and how both conjunctively reflect the splendor of their united evidence on some of the principal facts and most important truths in the

production. After this comes the collateral evidences found in the beneficial results of its publication and evinced by its wonderful success. Objections are answered and the conclusion follows.

Prior to the publication of Dr. Paley's "Evidences," but within the compass of his times, other apologetic works of great worth were issued from the English press. Jenyns wrote a book entitled "A View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion," of which Dr. Paley says, "I

should willingly, if the limits and nature of my work admitted of it, transcribe into this chapter the whole of what has been said upon the morality of the Gospel, by the author of 'A View of the Internal Evidence of Christianity,' because it perfectly agrees with my own opinion, and because it is impossible to say the same things so well."

This work is wholly employed in stating and explaining the following proposition: "First, that there is now extant a book

interposition of divine power; that is, that it must derive its origin from God."

Leslie's "Easy Method with the Deists" presents the historical evidences in a manner eminently meritorious, especially for its conciseness and simplicity. Lord Lyttleton considers "The conversion of St. Paul," and presents a most conclusive argument drawn from the fact of Paul's conversion in proof that "the Christian religion is a divine revelation."

Bishop Watson's "Apology for Christianity" is a reply

to Gibbon. The latter, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," attempted to account for the success of Christianity by natural causes; and Watson's "Apology" is a reply, given in the form of letters addressed to the author of the "Decline and Fall." Addressing him he says, "I shall simply endeavor to show that the causes you produce are either inadequate to the attainments of the end proposed, or that their efficiency, great as you imagine it, was derived from other principles than

those you have thought proper to mention." The line of thought here, then, is simply a reply to an objection alleged against the collateral argument from success. The same author replies to Paine's "Age of Reason," in letters addressed to Thomas Paine, and entitled an "An Apology for the Bible." This is an answer to alleged objections against the internal evidences of Christianity. Paine either in ignorance of what Christianity really is, or in a malignant opposition to what is true and good,

The Rev. Richard Watson, in his "Theological Institutes," presents the "Evidences of the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures" in the order and manner most common and most natural.

He almost entirely ignores intuition as a source of religious knowledge, and considers man as wholly dependent upon revelation for whatever he knows of God, of duty, and of destiny. The origin of those religious truths found in the writings of ancient philosophers he refers to

necessary to prove the necessity of a revelation, because no sensible man would claim that even with one, any man knew too much. But Mr. Watson elaborates the argument for the necessity of revelation at great length, and fully makes out a case much stronger than needful for the argument from necessity, which is, as he properly calls it, a presumptive argument for the fact. The first eight chapters of his work are occupied with this question, and the argument, in brief, is this:

Man is a moral agent; this implies a known rule of conduct; this knowledge he is incompetent to discover, therefore it has been revealed.

This reasoning, and the conclusion drawn from it, is confirmed by the condition as to the knowledge and practice of morals and religion among the heathen; and further, the state of morals and religion among the heathen proves that the original revelation had become so far obscured, as that new and additional revelations

evidences, with answers to miscellaneous objections; concludes the volume.

Dr. Archibald Alexander, Professor in Theological Seminary at Princeton, is the author of a most excellent work on the

“Evidences of the Authenticity, Inspiration, and Canonical Authority of the Holy Scriptures. He shows the right use of reason in religion; maintains that "it is impossible to banish all religion from the world, and if it were possible, it would be the greatest

improbable or unreasonable in such a manifest divine interposition as may be necessary to establish a revelation." These topics occupy five chapters of the book, after which comes the usual consideration of miracles and prophecies, then internal evidence, then the doctrine of inspiration, and lastly the canonical authority of the books of Scripture. This last topic receives comparatively more attention than is usual in works of the kind.

From the rise of English deism till recent times, the tendency in apologetics, so far as the method of discussion is concerned, has been to prove that God is the author of the Bible, and to infer that, therefore, the religion the Bible teaches is true. In recent times, among authors still living or recently dead, the tendency has been to prove that the religion the Bible teaches is true, and to infer, therefore, that God is the author of the Bible. The arguments in either case are substantially the same; the one treats external

evidence as primary and internal as secondary, and the other reverses the method.

Among recent authors, Dr. Hopkins, of Williams College, holds a prominent place. His treatise was first a course of lectures, prepared for and delivered before the Lowell Institute in Boston, and published in 1846. These lectures were extensively used as a textbook, and were, therefore, revised in 1863 and published in a form better suited to the requirements of the recitation room. The

arguments adduced for "the divine origin of the Christian religion" are its analogy to the works and natural government of God; its coincidence with natural religion; its adaptation to the conscience as a perceiving power; the perfection or its morality; its adaptation as a quickening and guiding power to the intellect, the affections, the imagination, the conscience, and the will; and also as a restraining power—the experience of believers; its fitness and tendency to become universal; the fact

that it has always been in the world—could not have been originated by man; the condition, character, and claims of Christ; miracles and prophecies; the propagation of Christianity, and its effects and tendencies.

The late Dr. Thomson, a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, delivered a course of thirteen lectures before the Theological School of the Boston University, and afterward repeated them before the Evanston Biblical Institute, which,

after his decease, were published under the title of Evidences of Revealed Religion." These thirteen lectures ate on the following topics, respectively: God, Spirituality, Immortality, Moral Government of God, Life a Probation, Future Punishment, Necessity of the Gospel, Advantages of the Gospel, Christ our Prophet, Christ our Priest, Christ our King, Miracles, Objections to the Cross: in each of which the doctrine under discussion is presented with such strength, perspicuity,

simplicity, and beauty, that the reader is not only convinced, but he is also captivated. The work is a valuable contribution to apologetic literature. Dr. Cocker's recent work on Christian evidences is in the same line of thought; its title is, "Lectures on the Truth of the Christian Religion." He evidently has in mind clearly apprehended all the phases of modern rationalism, and aims his artillery directly at the enemy before him. The distinct apprehension of the questions at issue, especially in their most

recent forms, the logical power and skill, and the scholarly attainments evinced by these lectures, make the volume indispensable to the student of the apologetics of our times.

The science of Christian evidences and Biblical criticism interpenetrate at many points; the former is incomplete without the latter; Horne's "Introduction" and Angus's "Hand-book" are classics in Biblical criticism; Dr. Nast's "Introduction" has special reference to the

questions of genuineness and authenticity, and is itself a most triumphant negative to all the assumptions of modern rationalism affecting the question of the inspiration and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures.

BOOK TWO: THEOLOGY PROPER

CHAPTER 9: THE BEING OF GOD.

1. THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF GOD.

IF to anyone the question were proposed, How came you in possession of the

understanding; of
conceptions of the ideal, to
imagination; and all
necessary ideas and truths,
called innate ideas and first
truths, to intuition. This
faculty is by some called
the reason; by others,
original suggestion; by still
others, original conception;
all meaning one and the
same thing—namely, the
nature and constitution of
the mind itself.

When, therefore, it is said
that the ideas of time,
space, substance, beauty,
sublimity, moral
obligation, and the idea of

religion—should be anything less than a first truth—should be anything dependent upon the contingencies of education—cannot be reasonably admitted. That which is right and wrong; that which in absolute truth obligates the conscience; that upon which character and destiny depends must, in the last analysis, be something in the constitution of the mind itself, not an accident of the mind's surroundings—not a contingency in the events of its history.

The idea of God is fundamental to all moral truths; therefore, the power to apprehend this idea must be a natural endowment conditioned only upon such occasions as are common to the race in its normal condition. That is to say, the idea is intuitive, innate—a product of the reason, of that faculty that constitutes man a rational being.

This view of the subject is fully sustained by the testimony of Paul given in the Epistle to the Romans. "That which may be known

brief refutation. The condition of ignorance and infantile development, implied in a total destitution of this fundamental truth, is a condition in which the logical faculty besides being itself extremely feeble finds but very limited employment; and if a mind in such a condition were capable of an argument, the terms necessary for its construction are the very things that are wanting.

The truth is, that by reasoning processes we

religion has become corrupted and morals have been debased.

Neither history nor tradition gives any intimations of a time when the whole world was destitute of the knowledge of God, nor has it ever been known that any people or any individuals utterly ignorant have of themselves without instruction discovered the doctrine of a divine existence.

These things are urged, not without some appearance of logical accuracy, as

determinative proofs that the mind of man without revelation is not capable of any religious knowledge. We reply, perfect ignorance and imperfect knowledge are two very different states of mind. That the unaided reason, merely in the light of nature and providence, is incompetent to discover and unfold those degrees of religious knowledge required for the higher forms of morals and religion, for those attainments in virtue and true excellence for which the benevolence of God has abundantly provided and

2. THE BIBLE IDEA OF GOD.

Manifestly any apprehension of the infinite possible to a finite mind must be incomplete—none but the infinite can fully comprehend the infinite. Some have, therefore, affirmed that God is unknowable—that all human apprehensions of the divine are only negations; that we can only think what God is not—cannot think what he is; that he is an object of faith, but in no good sense an object of knowledge. These

unrevealable; yea,
unknowing and unknown—
incapable of becoming a
cause, and is of necessity
sole, absolute existence.

It is evidently true that in the nature of the Divine Being it is impossible that the infinite God should come out of his own absolute eternity except as a person; but for personality, and perhaps for a trinity in personality, creation, and the existence of anything that is not God, were an impossibility. It is certain that human knowledge of God is

children unto the third and to the fourth generation: "God is a Spirit, the King eternal, immortal, invisible; the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning: he is the fountain of life; he only hath immortality; by him were all things created which are in heaven and in earth, whether they are visible or invisible; by him all things consist; he upholds all things by the word of his power; he fills heaven and earth with his presence; all things are naked and open before the

The Judge of the whole earth doeth right; clouds and darkness are round about him, but judgment and justice are the habitation of his throne. Oh the depths of the wisdom and knowledge of God! His judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out; he is good, and his mercy endureth forever; his tender mercy is over all his works.

God is rich in mercy for his great love wherewith he loved us; even when we were dead in sins he

3. PROOFS OF THE DIVINE EXISTENCE.

The sacred writers claim to speak by divine authority. They profess to communicate what had been given them by a divine inspiration. They authenticate their mission by signs and wonders wrought in attestation of their authority. They do not, therefore, attempt to prove by argument the truth of the doctrines they teach. Having furnished adequate evidence that their "thus saith the Lord" is yea and amen, they leave

so related to reasoning as that the original first conviction of its truth depends in any sense upon the conclusiveness of argument. The function of argumentation in this case is to develop the intuitive thought, to confirm and strengthen the original conviction, to illustrate it; and so exhibit its relations as to make it more and more applicable to practical and experimental purposes. A due consideration of those evidences of the divine existence, and the illustrations of the divine

every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” Words are channels of thought, means of communicating ideas; ideas of God are communicated by his works, his ways, and his word,—by nature, providence, and revelation. From the careful study and consequent clear apprehension of these things as instruments employed by the agency of the Divine Spirit religion receives its chief support.

Arguments adduced in support of the doctrine of

If this be an argument then all arguments are not syllogistic. Its defect may not be precisely pointed out; but its conclusiveness, if it be conclusive, is not obvious; probably most minds will reject it as a sophism. saying that this figure has three sides, therefore it has three angles, is more of the nature of a truism than of an argument; It is simply saying that a thing is what it is. The same may be true in respect to the idea of the most perfect being possible; clearly if such a being does exist his

existence is necessary, and to admit the actual existence of the idea seems to be an admission of the existence of its corresponding reality.

(2.) The cosmological argument is an argument from the existence of the universe regarded as an effect, which must have a cause external to itself, and ultimately necessitates the conception and actual existence of a first cause. Everyone is conscious of self and not self; all have intuitive knowledge of personal existence and the

space, he knows time as he knows succession, and in the same way he knows cause as well as he knows effect.

That the idea of cause and effect is not identical with the idea of stated antecedency and uniform succession is evident; for there is no more uniform succession than that of day and night, yet no man ever supposed that day was the cause of night, or night the cause of day. A cause has been defined to be a subject by whose existence another subject comes into

existence, or may, without contradiction, be supposed to come into existence. The word power indicates that in a cause by whose existence the effect comes into existence, or without contradiction may be supposed to come into existence. The absence of power in a subject to be otherwise than it is, is our idea of necessity.

Now, all these terms—cause, effect, power, necessity—represent clearly conceived apprehensions of the common intelligence, and

no man can make void in his own mind the conviction that they represent really existing things; the denial of causation is plainly contradicted by the common sense of mankind.

The personality of God is most conveniently made manifest by the teleological argument. This is all argument from the evidences or marks of design every-where seen in the material world. The argument as stated by Paley has never been answered and ought to be

somewhere a designing mind.

Illustrations of the teleological argument may be found in all departments of natural science, in anatomy, physiology, botany, natural philosophy, geology, and astronomy. Everywhere, in all the works of God, design is manifest, and so manifest as to necessitate the conception of a designer. The argument is conclusive when a single case is presented. The construction of the eye is so adapted to the laws of light,

and combinations of material particles, which is a supposition not tenable in thought. What may be thus said of the eye may be said of every part and of the whole of the entire animal kingdom. The organs of digestion, circulation, respiration, reproduction, all are wisely, wonderfully adapted to the purposes they serve; so are the bones, the muscles, the flesh, the skin, and specially the nerves, with their wondrous sensitiveness and close connection with mind. The

under the dictation of an antecedent intention, has brought things to be what and when and where they are.

THE MORAL ARGUMENT.

As the cosmological argument is from the existence of matter, so is the moral from the existence of mind; All men are conscious of thought, emotion, and volition, and they intuitively refer these phenomena to an underlying substance or subsistence to which the phenomena belong, called

soul, spirit, mind. Mind and matter are not the same, nor is mind a result of material organization. There are no subjects of thought which differ from each other by a greater difference than do the universal conceptions of mind and matter; no two subjects of thought differ from each other more than a spirit and a clod. Men may call themselves materialists, and think themselves sincere and logical, but in spite of themselves, whenever they think of spirit and matter they fail to complete their

It is said that knowledge has its beginning in sensation; that a man born blind and deaf, without smell, taste, or touch, could not acquire knowledge—would not be conscious—would be to himself the same as though he were not. It may be replied, This is so, but does not prove materialism; it only proves that man, in his present earthly existence, is dependent upon sensation for his first knowledge. The beginnings of thought in man, constituted as he is in his earthly life, are dependent upon sensation;

argument—"the universe is existent," therefore "God is"—cannot be successfully antagonized.

Again, man is conscious of moral obligation—of the feeling expressed in English by the terms *ought* and *ought not* . This sense of obligation is itself a cognition of rightful authority.

It has reference to law, and implies a lawgiver; it arises out of, and has its basis in, a sense of dependence. This sense of dependence and corresponding sense of obligation must, in the last

expresses itself in the contrite confession, "Against *thee* and *thee only* have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight." The prayer for pardon is, "God be merciful to me a sinner. The sense of forgiveness is uttered forth in a loving, grateful acknowledgment, "Though *thou* wast angry with me thine anger is turned away and *thou* comfortedst me." "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed my transgressions from me." "He brought me up put of an horrible pit, *he* put anew song into my mouth." The

ANTI-THEISTIC THEORIES.

Atheism is a negation incapable of proof. Under the limitations and conditions of human knowledge, the non-existence of spirit is an affirmation which from the nature of the case cannot be supported by proofs. A spirit may be present where I am, and I have no knowledge of his presence or existence; hence I can neither affirm nor deny as to his existence; of course any affirmation or denial as to the existence or non-

universal skepticism is impossible; man must believe something; and we affirm he must believe in self, in the universe and in God; where either of them is absent consciousness dies. What then is atheism? It is a professed belief in the non-existence of God; but is really a doubt respecting God voluntarily indulged. It is one thing to believe there is no God, and another to entertain doubts respecting him; the first is impossible, the second is easy and very common. Atheists sometimes attempt to

therefore, the infinitely good being is not omnipotent, hence there is no being all-powerful and of infinite goodness. The present writer does not remember of having met anything atheistic with more of the semblance of an argument than this; its obvious sophistry might logically be regarded as demonstration of the absurdities of its conclusion. Either horn of the dilemma or both of them may be smitten off at a blow. The prevention of vice, the source of evil, is not dependent upon

existence was equal to that of any other state of things? His answer does not satisfy himself nor anyone to whom he may propose it. The order, the harmony, the oneness of design, the evidences of contrivance every-where observable in his surroundings, the existence of power and the consciousness of choice in himself, indeed every object of knowledge both material and mental, all forbid the denial of efficient cause and necessitate the assumption of First Cause. Spontaneity,

or absolute beginning, in the sense that nothing produces something, is unthinkable.

Materialism is the affirmation that matter is eternal, and possesses, in itself, the promise and potency of all forms of life. This is contrary to the common sense of mankind. All men distinguish matter and mind as differentiated by greater differences than distinguish any other two objects of thought.

We intuitively refer the phenomena of mind to spirit-substance, and the

qualities of matter to material substance, and intuitively affirm that these entities are not one and identical, but two, having nothing in common.

The efforts of physiologists to absorb psychology; of physicists to annihilate mind; of so-called scientists to abolish philosophy and religion, are so manifestly antagonistic to the universal convictions of mankind as that but for their industry in scientific research, and the many valuable results of their

labors, the authors of those efforts would be justly subject to the contempt of their fellow-men. An example or two of such efforts may, for illustration, be worthy of notice. Positivism assumes that all knowledge is by sensation—man knows and can know nothing except what he sees, hears, tastes, smells, or touches—

that is, man positively knows the qualities of matter, and does not certainly know anything besides. Now, common sense affirms that in

that those elements be combined under the required conditions, and life in all its forms—vegetable, animal, and mental—will come into being.

This is modern science, by which, with the assumption of the eternity of matter, it is proposed to banish from existence the necessity for a Creator, if not the Creator himself. Another argument of the same kind may be mentioned here, as both may be answered by the same reply. It is found that chemical and physical

forces are, in the aggregate, always the same—what is expended in one form is reproduced in another. It is inferred that, therefore, the sum total of all forces, or the whole force of the universe, is immutably the same. This is called the conservation of forces. It is also found that chemical and physical forces are convertible—one may be changed to the other, and then the process may be reversed—this may become that, and then that may become this; heat produces motion, and motion produces heat. Whenever

force is exerted it is at an expense of other force equal to itself; this is called the correlation of forces. Now, since chemical and physical forces are subject to the laws of conservation and correlation, so also, therefore, are all forces, including vital and mental, subject to the same laws; that is to say, because heat may be converted to motion, therefore motion may be converted to life and thought. These are the most advanced atheistic arguments of modern scientists, briefly but fairly stated. Their statement is

sufficient refutation; they are plain cases of inferences from analogy where no analogy exists. Water is wholly a material substance: chemical and physical laws affect only matter; vitality, thought, emotion, and volition, have nothing in common with water, and are not at all subject to chemistry or mechanics. That class of modern scientists who reason as above are at great disadvantage in this particular discussion, because of their high pretensions to a close adherence to the

ETERNITY OF MATTER.

We have seen that actual existence proves eternal existence; since the universe does actually exist, somewhat must have existed always, or sometime nothing produced something; and since the latter is impossible, the former is certain. We have also seen that matter does not account for the existence of mind.

Mind, in some form, is eternal; may we not conceive a dualism and

affirm the eternal co-existence of both matter and mind? When the eternity of matter is affirmed simply to avoid the idea of creation out of nothing—it being conceded that all the known forms of matter are the products of infinite will—the affirmation seems to involve an effort to conceive of the essence or substance of matter apart from its' qualities or attributes—a conception which, if not impossible, is certainly fruitless and void. All psychologists agree that man knows nothing of the

in the sense of formation out of pre-existent substance, but have generally been regarded by critics as of themselves signifying the bringing into being something out of nothing. Most instances of reference to the work of creation in the Bible seem to imply this sense. In Hebrews 11:3, We have these words: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." This passage is, by some critics, considered

evolution of two elements, matter and force; which evolution proceeds under the operation of fixed laws. The lower organisms are first formed, then the higher, until man appears.

All life, whether animal, vegetable, or spiritual, is due to the working of physical and chemical forces in matter. As no power exists but in matter, there can be no divine being with creative power, nor any created human soul. The scientific naturalist knows only bodies and the properties

serve to enrich the earth and to nourish plants which feed other generations of men." The two classes of evolutionists above referred to differ chiefly, if not solely, in this, one starts with life leaving the origin of things unaccounted for; and the other boldly affirms the eternity and immutability of matter, as to its elements and as to the laws by which its temporary forms are determined. That the latter theory is the most pronounced atheism possible its abettors profess; that the former

inherent in matter, it as effectually removes God from the whole sphere of human existence, as, if there were no God, and matter were eternal. In the light of the latter theory, as much so as in the light of the former, moral obligation, virtue and vice, sin and salvation, in the senses in which these terms are used in systems of religion, are impossibilities, prayer is useless, and trust in Providence is a silly superstition. Now, what are the evidences on which these bold atheistic

gravitation, with something added; chemical affinity equals cohesion, with something added and so of all in the series; and man is the equal of all below him, with somewhat added which was not in either or all of them, either actually or potentially. The same law, that the higher equals all below, with something added, pervades all anatomical, physiological, and psychological constructions. God has not constructed this universe, so far as is yet known, even in any part of it, on the plan of evolution

same. What generically belongs to the higher is never evolved out of the lower. Evolution is not the law of vegetable and animal life.

Pantheism.— The difficulty in discussing this anti-theistic theory is, that no one seems to know precisely what is intended by the term. The doctrine of an extramundane personal creator, preserver, and governor of all things is denied, and pantheism is affirmed; but what pantheism is, it is difficult if not impossible to

clearly antagonize this form of pantheism. Others affirm that the one sole substance is mind, and this is idealistic pantheism, and is sufficiently refuted by the universal convictions of mankind. All men, idealists themselves included, continually think, speak, and act as though matter had a real existence, and it is not possible for them to think and act otherwise; if man does not certainly know that matter has a real existence, he does not know anything.

inherent errors, be rejected. The speculations by which the support of this theory is attempted are too obscure and unintelligible to admit of distinct and perspicuous reply; and since minds given to such speculations are not likely to trouble these pages or be troubled by them, they may be passed without further notice.

Dualism.— The theory that there are two eternal spirits, one good and the other evil, in eternal and perpetual conflict one with

the other, and that good or evil prevail in the universe as, for the time being, one or the other is in the ascendant, was, in olden times, held by some distinguished philosophers, and had, for a time, some influence among Christian sects. This, with another form of dualism which taught that God and matter are two co-existent and eternal entities, the latter being essentially evil and unmanageable, seems to have been resorted to mostly as a convenient method of accounting for the origin of evil. All forms

of dualism, as well as pantheism and atheism, are fatalistic, and tend to release the conscience from its sense of responsibility by referring to fate, or to incorrigible matter, or to an evil god, as the source of all unrighteousness, both in character and in conduct. This may account, in part, for the existence of these theories, and the persistence with which their abettors adhere to them, and the zeal with which they defend them. But at best they are mere theories, entirely without proof, and are supported

and their foolish heart was darkened; they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.”

CHAPTER 10: ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

WE have seen that the pantheistic idea of God is chiefly an effort to conceive an infinite, eternal, unconscious monad, without attributes or personality. The Christian idea sees the one infinite, eternal substance as subsisting in

I cannot conceive exhaustively the amount of water in the Atlantic Ocean, and yet I do know something about the Atlantic Ocean, and know that something certainly.

ANTHROPOPATHY.

The method of conceiving of the divine attributes, or, which is the same thing, the method of conceiving the idea of God, is, by the necessity Of the case, as follows: Man, by consciousness, has apprehensions of knowledge, emotion, and volition in himself; as best

this is anthropopathy. This is the only idea of God man has or can have. But God is not an infinite man; he is something essentially and necessarily different; therefore, man has not, and cannot have, a true idea of God. God is not all object of knowledge; he is at best only an object of faith.

These and kindred objections to the doctrine of the possible knowledge of God are put forth by some philosophers, and indeed by some theologians, with apparently great

Again, we believe in God not as a matter of unreasoning and unreasonable faith, but because our faith is founded in good and valid reasons. The infinite and absolute has come out of his eternity in his works, has created man in his own image, has endowed man with the power of apprehending God intuitively. Man, having intuitive knowledge of the divine existence, obtains further knowledge of the divine nature and character, or of what God is, by what he does. The

that sacred "Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

UNITY OF GOD.

God is one in the sense that he is pure, simple being—not compounded. He is one, in the sense of sole, solitary being. He has no companion, there is no other being of the same kind. He is one, in the sense of *necessary* simple and solitary being; there not only is no other God, but there *cannot be* another.

The Bible proofs of the divine unity are sufficient and satisfactory. "The Lord our God is one Lord;" "The Lord he is God, and there is none else beside him;" "Thou art God alone;

"Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever, Amen." A

priori ontological arguments are of but little value in discussing the doctrine of the divine attributes, beyond showing that Christian faith is not antagonized, but the rather

sustained by sound logic. For example, examine the argument from necessary being: take it in its briefest form, I have an idea of the most perfect being possible; a being who has equals is not so perfect as one who is superior to all others, and therefore solitary and alone; hence, the being of whose existence I have a conception is one who is necessarily pure, simple, solitary being, who has not and cannot have an equal.

The cosmological argument is more useful because

many and gods many, and in abject servility fall down and worship them.

SPIRITUALITY OF GOD.

God is a Spirit; is mind, not matter, not body; pure spirit, unconnected with any bodily form or organ; "the invisible God whom no man hath seen nor can see," "the Father of spirits," "the God of the spirits of all flesh." The contradictory of this doctrine is materialism, which has been sufficiently discussed in these pages. When we say God is a spirit, we are

certain we say something and that that something is true, and yet we know not what we say; that is, we have not an exhaustive conception of all that is expressed by the words we employ; we do not know fully what a spirit is. The term is defined by saying it is not matter; or again, by saying it is that that thinks, feels, and wills—the former tells what spirit is not, and the latter what it does; but neither expresses what it is. The idea we have of what the divine spirit is, is derived from our idea of what the human spirit is;

this involves the actual existence of a real entity, a substance, an individual simple substance, endowed with power to know, to feel, and to will, a person conscious, of self and not self, capable of moral actions and susceptible of moral character. These elements of being, conceived of as without limitation or defect, with all other known or unknown possible perfections infinite in degree, make up our idea of God, and this, in the light of our conscious intuitions, confirmed,

illustrated and enlarged by revelation, we are confident is, so far as it goes, a true idea; our knowledge of God is at best extremely limited and imperfect, but it is still positive knowledge; of his spirituality and consequent self-conscious personality we cannot reasonably doubt. The Bible teaches us to address God as "our Father;" to believe in him as having spoken at sundry times and in divers manners unto the fathers; as an object of worship, to be trusted in with all confidence; as preserver,

benefactor, and redeemer. We are to look to him for salvation. He "is God, and beside him there is no Savior." In all that the Bible teaches respecting man's intercourse with his Maker, it represents God as a person, a spirit, in whose image man is created, whose likeness we are, and the knowledge of whom is like unto the knowledge we have of ourselves.

ETERNITY OF GOD.

When it is said that God is eternal, the primary idea is, that his existence had no beginning and will have no

end; but evidently the Scripture representations and the philosophic thought involve something more than the mere idea of infinite duration: eternity is regarded as an attribute God; that is, he is eternal in the sense that it is his nature to exist. He is the "I am;" necessary existence is involved in the idea of his being and nature; so that the supposition that at any moment of infinite duration his non-existence is possible, is self-contradictor, is absurd." Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou

thousand years in his sight are but as yesterday, when it is past. One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." He is "the same, yesterday, and to-day and forever," and "which is, which was, and which is to come." He is the eternal everlasting God who only hath immortality.

It is sometimes said that these affirmations so evidently true are equivalent to the affirmation that with God there is no past or future,

reasonable doubt; beyond this, probably silence is wiser than speculation.

IMMUTABILITY.

God is unchangeable, with him there "is no variableness or shadow of turning." He is "the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." He saith of himself, "I am the Lord, I change not."

His name, "I am," indicates both his eternity and his immutability. Since as to his existence he is eternal and independent, nothing that is not God could

variable in the application of those principles as are the ever varying objects to which they apply.

OMNIPOTENCE.

Man is conscious, that within limits he is first cause; he originate effects, he is the conscious author of intentional acts. That in himself by whose existence somewhat else comes into existence, he calls *power*. Power or force in man is very limited; he, produces most of what he brings to pass, by his control over other forces; most of the effects of which man is

reigneth, and doeth his
pleasure among the armies
of heaven and the
inhabitants of the earth. He
spreadeth out the heavens
and treadeth upon the
waves of the sea; he
maketh Arcturus, Orion,
and Pleiades and the
chambers of the South; he
doeth great things past
finding out, yea, and
wonders without number.
He stretcheth out the north
over the empty place and
hangeeth the earth upon
nothing. He bindeth up the
waters in the thick clouds,
and the cloud is not rent
under them; he

compasseth the waters
with bounds until the day
and night come to an end.
He brake up for the sea a
decreed place and sets bars
and doors, and said,
Hitherto shalt thou come
and no further, and here
shall thy proud waves be
stayed. He looketh to the
end of the earth and seeth
under the whole heaven to
make the weight for the
winds, to weigh the waters
by measure, to make a
decree for the rain and a
way for the lightning of the
thunder. He hath measured
the waters in the hollow of
his hand, and meted out

and sublime because the thing described is itself the perfection of sublimity. These are not the invented words of a poetic fancy, but the words of truth and soberness, literally presenting the thought intended. They teach distinctly that all possibilities are subject to the divine power, God's volitions are competent to produce all that can be. That which is not doable, contradictions, absurdities, are not subjects of power; it is no limitation of power to say that it cannot cause the same thing to be and not to

be, at the same time. Axioms, mathematical, and ethical as well, are not subjects of power; principles of right and wrong, of beauty and deformity, are like axioms and first truths, eternal, immutable, not effects or results of causes, and stand in no correlation to power. The angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles not because Cod willed they should be; it is not germane to the nature of the case to say the divine power might have caused them to be less or more. That it is right that social

logical, neither good philosophy, nor sound theology. God is not sole being nor sole agent; there are other beings and other first causes; and the fact that God created those other beings and constituted them first causes does not, therefore, cause them to be non-existent, or not to be what God made them. There are other existences in the universe besides God, and there are other efficient agents; things are done which God does not do. All things are possible to God, but it is not true that all

possibilities are necessitated; some things are possible which do not exist, and some things exist which might have been non-existent.

OMNIPRESENCE.

"Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. Can

any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord? Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Thus saith the Lord, Behold heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool.

Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee.

Though he dig into hell, thence shall my hand take him; though he climb up into heaven, thence will I bring him down; and though he hide himself in

the top of Carmel, I will reach and take him out from thence. In him we live and move and have our being. He filleth all things." "God is every-where, but he is not everything. All things have their being in him, but he is distinct from all things. He fills the universe, but is not mingled with it. He is the intelligence which guides, and the power which sustains, but his personality is preserved, and he is independent of the works of his hand."

Like all other ideas we have of God, the idea of ubiquity is anthropopathic. Within the limits within which we know by immediate knowledge what transpires, and within which we have the power of effecting immediate results, we conceive ourselves as present; we, as best we can, remove all limitations from this apprehension, and thus conceive of a presence which is co-extensive with unlimited space; or, of a person having immediate knowledge of all that transpires, and power to effect immediate results in

piety and sound philosophy.

OMNISCIENCE.

“Known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world. Lord, thou hast searched me and known me; thou knowest my down sitting and mine up rising, thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue but lo! O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. The darkness hideth not from

thee, but the night shineth
as the day. The ways of
man are before the eyes of
the Lord, and he pondereth
all his goings. He searcheth
their hearts and
understandeth every
imagination of their
thoughts. Hell is naked
before him, and
destruction hath no
covering. Great is the Lord,
and his understanding is
infinite. He that planted
the ear, shall he not hear?
he that formed the eye,
shall he not see? he that
teacheth man knowledge,
shall he not know? The
eyes of the Lord are in

knowledge in his creatures, differing only in degree and perfection—theirs is limited, his without limitation; theirs inadequate and imperfect, his complete and perfect in kind and degree. Man knows certainly but a very few things; God knows all things with absolute and infallible certainty. But knowledge is knowledge, whether human or divine. To affirm that knowledge is ascribed to God only by a figure of speech, just as he is said to have eyes and ears and hands, is to undermine the whole

other idea of God, has its difficulties, many and great. The chief difficulty is accepting the doctrine of the divine omniscience as just now defined is met when the attempt is made to reconcile the divine prescience with the doctrine of free will and moral responsibility. It is said if all future events, the volitions of men included, are foreknown, then are they certain; if certain, they cannot be otherwise. If human volitions cannot be otherwise than they are, how can men be held

antagonistic that one or the other must be rejected, then the argument is sound, and foreknowledge of moral actions must be denied, for man knows nothing more certainly than he knows that he is morally responsible. But, secondly, the Bible abounds with prophecies of future events in which human agency and free-will are as obviously concerned as in any events of human life; therefore, the two, foreknowledge and free-will, are not contraries: and thirdly, the argument is fallacious in

WISDOM.

The usual classification of the divine attributes into natural and moral is of but little, if of any, worth.

Omniscience and Omnipotence are classed among what are called the natural attributes; but knowledge and power are elements in the nature of a moral agent. Again, wisdom is classed among the moral attributes, but it is as essential to the nature of God as any of the so-called natural attributes; indeed, it is implied in Omniscience or may be

than the best. As all the works of God evince design, so do they declare his wisdom. The glory of God and the good of his creatures are the highest ends known to thought, and every-where in all God's works, from least to greatest, there are wonderful adaptations to the accomplishment of these high intents. In history as well as in natural science, divine wisdom is displayed on every page; providence, as well as nature, evinces a controlling power, making all things work together for

good. The Scriptures abundantly confirm these views. In redemption divine wisdom is specially revealed. By the Church through all ages, to principalities and powers the manifold wisdom of God is made known. "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; he is the only wise God. O Lord, how manifold are thy works; in wisdom hast thou made them all."

GOODNESS.

Goodness is a generic term; the species included under

which is awakened by the apprehension of rational and moral excellencies in its object. The term admiration expresses nearly the same thing. Mercy is kindness exercised toward the miserable; it includes pity, compassion, forbearance, and gentleness. Grace is love exercised toward the unworthy.

Goodness considered as an attribute of the Divine Being, a trait in his character, an element of his nature, including all that is expressed by the several

terms above mentioned, prompting desires for, and efforts toward, the well-being of all his creatures, is the topic of present discussion. That God is good in the sense above defined is abundantly asserted in the Holy Scriptures. "God is love; he is good; his mercy endureth forever; good and upright is the Lord; thou, Lord, art good and ready to forgive, and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon thee. The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his

works. There is none good but one, that is God.

Gracious is the Lord and righteous, yea our God is merciful; with the Lord there is mercy and with him there is plenteous redemption. The Lord is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and of great mercy. The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for

thousands, forgiving
iniquity and transgression
and sin. Thou, O Lord, art a
God full of compassion and
gracious, long suffering
and plenteous in mercy
and truth.

The philosophy of the
absolute and infinite, as it
denies all consciousness in
God, so of course it denies
all passivity, and here it
seems to fancy, is its
special forte. God it is said,
cannot love; for if he do, he
is related to, limited by,
and dependent upon, that
which is the object of his
affection; and this is plainly

execute for the happiness of his creatures may be easy, but to reconcile such a faith with the facts of human observation and experience is extremely difficult, and perhaps to man in his earthly condition impossible. To reconcile the existence of evil with the goodness of God is the problem of *theodicy*, a problem that, through all the ages, has occupied the profoundest thought of men the most highly endowed, the most extensively learned, as well as the most devoutly pious. Science, philosophy, and

religion have contributed their richest treasures to the solution of this problem. The best abilities and largest resources of mankind have been employed; but it is not too much to say that as yet no solution has been obtained which is satisfactory to any considerable portion of those who give their thoughts to this subject. Fatalists, Atheists, Materialists, Pantheists, and Dualists, all agree that what is, is because it could not not be; all existences and events are necessary; there are no contingencies;

selected from the infinite resource to make the most of us. The fact of sin unlocked the door to highest destiny. In the throng of evils that assail us, there are none that yield their strength to virtue's struggling arm with such munificent reward of power as great temptations. We may win by toil, endurance; saintly fortitude by pain; by sickness, patience; faith and trust by fear." Without injury there could be no forgiveness; without anger, no meekness; without perverseness, no long

suffering; without poverty, no charity; without storms and tempests, no clear air. The maxim of optimism that "whatever is, is best,"

not only reconciles the existence of evil with the divine goodness, but it also makes evil a natural and necessary out flowing of the infinite benevolence; yea, more, it is that without which the divine good-will could not be manifest. Evil is the necessary antecedent to at least some forms of good.

In support of this theory, it is further said that from the

possible and actual? I trow not.

Sin, the source of evil, and itself the chief of all evils, is that which God hates—which he has forbidden and will punish; it is that which all good angels and good men deprecate and deplore; it is that on account of which all sinners are in infinite peril and should repent, and for which, in the want of repentance, they will suffer punishments inconceivably great.

The arguments by which the support of the theory is

attempted are fallacious. The good that comes of evil might have been, though in other forms, without it. The angels who kept their first estate are not miserable or less holy and happy because they did not sin. God is infinitely holy and happy without any shadow of turning—without any dependence upon evil or connection with it.

Good-will, love with all its fruits, might have subsisted between man and man though all were "holy, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing;" nay, more,

cause and effect. The strength of the oak has come from the violence of the winds which have swept over the mountain on which it stands, but the natural tendency of the wind was to uproot the tree. It stands, because it had life in itself. That that life has made the violence of the storm the occasion of its development does not prove that the wind was the cause of the life; contrariwise, the life is in spite of the winds, and perhaps might have been developed as well or better without them. However it

may be with the tree, it is so with virtue. Virtue lives only in the absence of sin, and lives the better in the absence of sin's consequences. If the wrath of man ever praise God, it is because the power of God causeth it to praise him, not because there is in the wrath itself anything tending either to the glory of God or the good of men. If the afflictions of the present life work for the saints, in the life to come, "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," it is not because there is any redeeming and sanctifying

the glory of God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ that he hath done all things well.

Optimism in this sense is orthodox and Scriptural.

That form of optimism, or rather that extravagant theory of the divine sovereignty which teaches that evil and sin are, because "God decreed" them—because "he prefers sin to holiness in all cases where it occurs," especially when the idea of the divine decree includes or implies a divine efficiency effecting or securing the execution of

of its difficulties by the affirmation that evil is temporary. The

Universalist theodicy is optimistic, modified by a relieving clause which affirms that sin and its consequences having wrought out a substantial and remunerating good for the universe, will finally come to an end. It is sufficient for our present purpose to say of this theory that it is not proved; contrariwise, it is affirmed of "many" that they "shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." On the authority of this

perils the possibility of an infinite good is itself an evil inconceivably great, and in all cases where the peril becomes fatal, the evil is infinite, though considered only in the light of what is lost.

The annihilation of the sinner does not annihilate the evil of sin; it therefore leaves the question of theodicy unanswered.

The theory of pre-existence has been put forth by some as a solution of this problem, and may deserve a passing notice. It is alleged that no theory of

consideration is found in the assumption that it is a theory which explains the difficulties of the case. Second, when our Lord's disciples asked him concerning the man born blind whether his blindness was a punishment for pre-existent sin, he answered that it was not. Third, the theory, instead of solving the problem, only removes it to another sphere of action. Though it be admitted that this world is a penitentiary for the punishment of criminals, or a reform school for the reformation of hopeful

sin, at best we are compelled to assume it; the assumption is no aid to present thought; it is not a satisfactory adjustment of the case; the assumption is fruitless as well as baseless: If the theory of pre-existence be true we do not know it, and it is of no service to assume it.

Orthodox writers when discussing the doctrine of the divine goodness, generally regard the question of evil as having sole reference to this life, and the inquiry proposed is, simply whether the

sufferings endured by animals and men during their earthly existence is an objection to the doctrine of the divine goodness. It is obvious that the argument considered in this light is of but little value logically; it is useful for purposes of illustration, and may sometimes relieve a mind perplexed with the clouds and darkness that surround the throne of the divine administrator of human affairs. That God is good is implied in our intuitive apprehensions of his nature; no man can propose to himself the

object. The existence of animals that are venomous, and of animals that prey one upon, another seems to be evidence of evil design in the contrivance; but though we are unable to show that it is not, it would still be but an unexplained exception of diminutive importance. Death must come to animals in some way; perhaps in all cases where it occurs, death by violence is better for the dying than death by decay or acute disease. Apparent, or, if required, real exceptions being admitted, the general experience of

mankind and the constitution and management of all things under the sun indicate benevolent designs and illustrate the benevolent intent of the designer. In considering the question of earthly evils in their relation to the divine goodness, the following considerations must be taken into account:

First, most of the sufferings of the present life are self-imposed. Did all men use their best diligence to acquaint themselves with the laws of their being, and

of the greatest good. All these voices agree in affirming that evil is a necessity, made necessary either by the eternal nature of things or by the eternal nature of God.

All theists, except the optimist, deny the necessity of evil and affirm that it is a contingency; a somewhat which might not have been. It is the creation of a creature, it is by the abuse of free-will; it is the creation of a creature endowed within limits with causative power, made under law, with freedom

both to and from acts of obedience or disobedience; having, with respect to these acts of voluntary obedience or disobedience, without limitation or restriction, the power of choice; fully able to stand in perpetual perfect loyalty, and free to fall into rebellion and transgression. Such a being thus endowed with an either-causal, alternative power, uses his free will in acts of transgression—he disobeys a just command; disrespects righteous authority, violates a moral obligation, does what he

on its occurrence he adjusted his administration to its existence. He exerts divine power for its punishment in accordance with the demands of justice, and through grace puts its results under contribution for the furtherance of his purposes of good will toward his creatures. It is sufficient for present purposes to say, in a word, sin and evil exist by the divine permission; and the question returns, How is this consistent with the divine benevolence? For the sake of easy advances toward the difficulties of

possible, but was foreseen to be certain?

It is not uncommon to reply that as it was better that eternal life should be made possible to finite beings even at the expense of eternal death to some, to whom no injustice is done, to whom eternal life is as possible as to others, and whose destiny is their due and self-imposed, than that eternal life should be denied to all that is not God; it was an act of kindness and good-will in the great Creator to confer upon the universe such a

punishment of transgressors whose existence is postulated, but does not reach the question of the divine goodness in the creation of those whose ruin is foreseen.

As a solution of the difficult problem now under consideration, it is sometimes said that existence under any conditions that infinite goodness will permit must be better than non-existence. This, if admitted, solves the problem, divine goodness is vindicated, and

all the difficulties in the case disappear.

But it is objected that this teaches the doctrine of a tolerable hell, minifies the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and contradicts what our Lord said of Judas, that it were better for him if he had not been born. In reply, it may be said that existence, though involving evil inconceivably great, may be better than non-existence. Thousands in this world are in conditions which other thousands pronounce worse than non-existence, but they

reconcilable one with the other is, therefore, beyond question; but how, to human thought, they are to be reconciled, is yet a question, and it may so remain till God himself, in the final issues of man's earthly history, shall vindicate his ways, and every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that God hath done all things well.

HOLINESS.

"Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel and say unto them, Ye shall be

character; it is a characteristic of the divine nature by which he approves of the right and condemns the wrong, always with perfect rectitude and with infinite in intensity. Virtue and vice in man have respect to law—to the will of another who, by reason of existing relations, is endowed with legislative authority; hence the question arises whether holiness or virtue in God has respect to law, or is God so a law unto himself as that this idea of conformity to law must be eliminated from the

conception of divine holiness? Our answer to this question, as already given in another connection, is, that there is nothing anterior or exterior to God that can be thought of as controlling him, or determining in any sense what he is, or what he does. His will is the universal law. It is sufficient for all purposes of truth or science in ethics and religion to say this or that is right, because it is God's will that *it* and not its opposite should be, and this or that is wrong because God has forbidden

is also true that God wills it because it is right. There are eternal, immutable principles in ethics and religion, as there are in mathematics and philosophy.

God is infinitely holy, then, not merely because he is in perfect and eternal harmony with himself, but also because he is in perfect and eternal harmony with the principles of truth and righteousness; or, if the term is preferred, with "the eternal fitness of things." It pertains to his essential nature that he forever

full of thy glory." The Church triumphant and militant in responsive worship, adoringly answer, "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

JUSTICE.

Justice, considered as an attribute of God, is that in the divine nature which prompts God to exact and to render that which is due. As Creator, he has the right of proprietorship, and therefore the authority to

consideration, justice demands that this should be rendered.

Justice, psychologically considered—regarded as a phenomenon of mind, sometimes called the sense of justice—is a sentiment or state of the sensibility, and arises intuitively on a presentation by the intellect of the facts in the case or the relations of the parties concerned. It belongs to the same class of mental states as the sense of the beautiful, the good, the true, the suitable, fit, or proper arising in the same

benefit of others, which is unjust, unless he deserves to suffer. Again, if the disposition to sin is just ground for the execution of the penalty due to crime, could that disposition be proved without the sin, a man innocent of the act might be punished for the act. Governmental ends cannot be the sole basis of penal sanctions; it is evidently right and just that the public weal should be protected; it would be unjust to the citizens of the commonwealth if it were not; it is right and just for the protection of others

The reformation of the culprit may be sought in the administration of the government; but it is not the purpose of penalty. In most cases penalty is not adapted to reformation; certainly hanging is not; imprisonment usually hardens, obdurates the culprit, strengthens and confirms his depravity. The truth is approached when it is said that the transgressor deserves the penalty inflicted, because he has violated obligation; because he has disregarded lawful and rightful authority; because he has

the reformation of the culprit, or to the protection of the common weal; perfectly independent of all antecedents and consequents, the outraged sense of justice demands the punishment of the criminal, because that outraged sense of justice, in the public mind, intuitively affirms that punishment is due for the sin, for the sin considered in itself, the sin is itself an insult to justice and the penalty a satisfaction to justice. This sense of a just demand for penal suffering in the mind of man, we

relinquished without injustice which might be justly demanded and exacted, will be hereafter considered under the head of soteriology.

It may not however be an unwise anticipation to say here, that if on Bible authority it may be affirmed that the death of Christ was a satisfaction to retributive justice, and that justification is an announcement by the judge, under law and according to law, that the demands of justice are satisfied, then it may be

violation of legal obligation or governmental claims by the death of Christ. Though it be considered conceivably possible that through an atonement securing all the ends of government, meeting all the obligations of the divine governor to the subjects of his government, the penal sufferings due to the justice of God, or which is the same thing, justly due to God himself, considered as an individual person, might, without injustice, be relinquished; or, to state the same thing in another form, though it

dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.”

CHAPTER 11: TRINITY.

HITHERTO we have been discussing topics involving truths and doctrines which, whether discoverable by the unaided reason of man or not, are such as when once discovered are, on rational grounds, admitted to be true. Some of them are intuitively accepted; others, though requiring arguments, are found, on examination, to be so nearly self-evident that the process of demonstration is brief, and the argument is

affirmation, in the light of reason, that what the Bible says God says, then, secondly, the reasonable inquiry is, What is the Bible testimony as to the doctrine under discussion? Thus it is evident that though the doctrine be a doctrine of faith above reason, and outside of argumentation on rational grounds, it is not therefore unreasonable or contrary to reason. Faith founded on a "Thus saith the Lord," if founded on adequate reasons for believing that the Lord has thus said, is a reasonable faith.

The creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the doctrine of the Trinity, as expressed in its "Articles of Religion," is as follows:

"ART.

I.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity. —There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one

substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

"ART.

2.

Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very man.—The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person,

never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men.

"ART.

3.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.—Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's

nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

"ART.

4.

Of the Holy Ghost.—The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God."

The Apostles' Creed, so called, is in the following words:

again according to the Scriptures and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who, with the Father and the Son together, is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission

of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.

Amen."

The so-called Athanasian Creed contains among other similar formulas, the following: "We worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance; the person of the Father is one, of the Son another, of the Holy Spirit another; but the divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is one,

Arius, who flourished from about A. D. 311 onward, taught that there was a time when Christ was not—that he is a created being, but is the first created and the greatest, next to God, endowed with delegated power to create, govern, save, and judge the world. The prevalence and power of Arianism occasioned the convocation of many synods, and employed some of the most acute and profound intellects the Church has ever seen. The struggles invoked by it and carried on through many years under the leadership

doctrine as to defend the Church against the incoming of heresies.

The Apostolic Fathers were content with the formulas of the New Testament. They found in the baptismal formula and in the apostolic benediction a statement of the doctrine of God—of the Holy Trinity—that was satisfactory to their piety. In their writings no efforts are apparent that evince any desire for anything more scientific, and doubtless if errors had not arisen the New Testament itself

would have been the sole symbol of the militant Church. The issue, as it has been in all the ages of ecclesiastical history, and the issue as it now is, is distinctly and definitely stated in the question, Does the Bible teach that there are three persons in one God? or, does the Bible teach that the substance or essence of the Logos or pre-existent Christ is one and the same with the substance or essence of God the Father?

The argument is purely and wholly an appeal "to the

law and the testimony;" it is a question of exegesis, of interpretation. If the Bible does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine must be rejected, for it is not claimed that it can be maintained by rational evidences. Any attempt at explanation, illustration, or argument from analogy or otherwise, must be worse than useless—must be injurious; for this mystery of the Godhead is evidently *sui generis*; there is nothing analogous, within the range of human knowledge; and without doubt there is not, and

there cannot be, anything
analogous existent
anywhere in space, or at
any time in duration. There
is but one God, and there is
not, and cannot be,
another—either another
person or another thing
that is so like him in this
mystery of his nature that
it may represent him.
Hence explanations,
illustrations, analogies
must mislead, as they
direct thought to that
which, if not contrary and
opposite, is different and
unlike. The only resort is
"to the law and the
testimony." If it be

Absurdities cannot be believed, no matter who states them—though an angel or even God. If the doctrine of the Trinity were an affirmation that three are one, in respect to the same thing, in the same sense; if it were affirmed that three Gods are one God, or that three persons are one person, then would the statement be arithmetically absurd, and could not be believed on any authority whatever. But evidently the millions of millions of Christian believers, who have professed faith in the

doctrines of the Church, have not all of them been so insane as to profess faith in an absurdity, nor have they so stated their belief as to be justly chargeable with such insanity. The affirmation that there are three persons in one God, is an affirmation not that God is both three and one in the same sense, but that he is one as to essence and three as to persons—unity and trinality are affirmed of the same being, but in different senses. Or, again, the affirmation has respect to the manner of the divine subsistence, or at the most,

to the inscrutable, ineffable nature of God, and affirms a distinction; or, again, the divine nature is such, or the manner of the divine subsistence is such, as admits of a distinction; that distinction is three—I, thou, he; Father, son, and Holy Spirit. The Bible in many places expresses such a distinction, and in many others implies it. Dogmatic theology, for self-defense against heresy, marks that distinction. for the want of a better term, names it a distinction of persons, and announces its interpretation in the

Son, and the Holy Spirit; one in essence, three in a distinction of persons,—I am persuaded, by the evidence of inspiration, and the laws of interpretation, by adequate reasons for believing that God has so said, that what I say is true, though I do not understand the full import of the words I use, and though I know nothing and can believe nothing as to the manner of the fact stated.

The charge of illiberality for insisting upon faith in the Holy Trinity as a

morals, and religion; as is a man's idea of God, not merely of what God thinks and feels and does, but of what he is as to his nature and manner of subsistence, so is the man's philosophy and religious faith, so is his moral character and religious experience. Ignorance of God in some respects, is not a bar to the attainment of man's highest possibility; but it is fairly presumable, that whatever revelation God has made of himself is not only useful, but is also essential to the attainment of man's highest good. "To

know God and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent, is eternal life." The perfection of eternal life, or principle of man's highest, greatest good, is therefore proportionate to the correctness and completeness of the knowledge man has of God. If God has revealed himself, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it must be not useless, but of the highest importance, that our apprehension correspond with the revelation. If a man deny the divinity of the Son of God, and deny the

If a man deny the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his faith be consistent with itself, he will also deny the doctrine of atonement as received and believed by the great body of the Christian Church. As a logical sequence of these denials, there will follow the denial of original sin, of regeneration by the supernatural agency of the Spirit, of justification by faith only—in a word, of all the doctrines which distinguish an evangelic from a rationalistic faith. This is not mere theory; the

Church relations, accomplished by man's volitions. Justification and salvation are not conditioned upon faith only. Salvation is conditioned upon educational processes, upon self-culture, upon good works, upon deeds of kindness and charity—in a word, Unitarianism is entirely another Gospel. The interpretations of the New Testament by Unitarians are from first to last—from alpha to omega—entirely different from the interpretations of Trinitarians. The systems

We expect to show, in pages following, that all that is included in the statement, "There are three person in one God, of equal power and eternity," is explicitly stated in the language of the Bible—that is to say, we expect to show that it is explicitly stated that God is one; that divine titles, attributes, works, and worship, are ascribed equally to Father, to Son, and to the Holy Spirit; that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinct persons; that the Father is first, the Son second, and the Spirit third; that in acts of

creation, preservation, and government, the three concur; that creation is predominantly referred to the Father, redemption to the Son, and sanctification to the Spirit; that generation is exclusively predicated of the Father, filiation of the Son, and procession of the Spirit.

CHAPTER 12: BIBLE PROOFS OF TRINITY.

I. GOD is one. We have discussed the divine unity under the head of attributes. Wherever Christianity has obtained a hearing, polytheism, if

II. The Father is a person, and is God. That he who is referred to in Scripture by the titles Father, our Father, the Father, is the same as Jehovah, the Lord God, the God of Israel, the only living and true God, is not a matter of question.

Whether the title primarily refers to God as a being, or as a person, is not here important. It is sufficient in this connection simply to say the somewhat, whatever it be, spoken of in the Scriptures under the title, the Father, our Father, is God; the object

they were called Docetists and Phantasiasts.

The Monarchians, or Patripassians, asserted that the one person of the Godhead united itself with a human body, but not with a rational human soul. The Monophysites affirmed one nature only, probably conceiving that what of human nature there was in Christ was transmuted into the divine. The Monothelites admitted two natures—the human and divine—but affirmed but one will.

These, with the Nestorian and other heresies in Christology, caused the assembling of the council at Chalcedon, in 451. The Chalcedon symbol, which has been during the centuries since its publication, and is now, the standard of orthodoxy in Christology, reads thus: "We teach that Jesus Christ is perfect as respects Godhood, and perfect as respects manhood; that he is truly God and truly a man, consisting of a rational soul and a body; that he is consubstantial with the Father as to his

wept; was troubled in spirit, recognized filial and fraternal relations, indulged friendships, felt aversions; he was a high-priest touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin; he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears; was crucified, dead, and buried; he lived the life and died the death of a man; he called himself the Son of man, and was called our elder brother; he was a man whose human nature partook of all that

founder of the Christian religion. The Word was made flesh—that is, the Logos, or head of the Church, was a man. This interpretation makes the first verse of John's Gospel simply a silly truism, and leaves the fourteenth utterly void of meaning. John viii, 58: "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am." Here pre-existence is directly affirmed. The form of expression denotes eternity. If mere pre-existence had been intended, Christ would

have said, before Abraham was, *I* was. Preexistence is included, and, as is evident from the context, is the primary thought. According to Socinian exegesis the Savior said, Before Abraham, I existed in the purpose and plan of God; or, Before Abraham becomes the father of many nations, I exist—an affirmation perfectly innocent, as any man living in those times, or at any time since, might say the same thing; and yet for saying what he did the Jews were not only surprised, but were also

above all; he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven; I am the bread of life; I am the bread which came down from heaven."

Again, Christ is often spoken of as coming into the world in such a manner as clearly implies his pre-existence: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. "The passage cannot be rationally interpreted as

accommodate a theory, read this passage and construe it as though it read, "glorify thou me with the glory thou, before the world was, didst ordain to bestow upon me?" if not, then the common construction must stand, and the existence of Christ before the world was must be admitted.

c. *The Titles of Christ.*—The names by which God is known among men are ascribed to Christ. In no case where a name of deity is used as a name of Christ is there any intimation that

"the Word was with *the* God and the Word was a God," is more literal and correct than that of the common version.

In reply, we remark, first, on the authority of critics, than whom none have a more thorough knowledge of the Greek language, that in nearly all cases where the article is used both before the subject and the predicate, the two are convertible; so that whatever may be affirmed of the one may also be affirmed of the other. According to this usage of

the Greek, if the last clause of the verse had read, "and the Word was the God," it would have affirmed that whatever may be predicated of God the Father, may be also predicated of the Word or Logos; which, in this case, would be to affirm that the God and the Logos were one and the same (the affirmation of the Patripassians of ancient, and the Swedenborgians of modern, times). But evidently this would make the third clause contradict the second; it says the Logos was *with* God. Now,

possible; ye cannot serve God and mammon. No man hath seen God at any time." Thirdly, that the word God, as applied to Christ in this first verse of John's Gospel is not used in a subordinate, but in its highest sense, is evident from what follows in the third verse—"All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." Here creation is ascribed to the Logos, which accords with and confirms the declarations of verses first and second.

sense of the term. This passage, then, presents an instance in which not only a name or title of deity, in its highest sense, is ascribed to Christ, but is also itself an affirmation that Christ is God. No form of expression could be a stronger affirmation unless it should be thought that the use of the present tense of the verb would be. If the passage read "the Word was with God and the Word is God," it would accord more fully with the usage of all languages in speaking of that which is immutable and eternal. But

abyss—an unrevealed and unrevealable, unconscious, inactive, though self-evolving, inconceivable something. By the self-evolution of the abyss, ons came to be—called ons, eternal beings, because, in the abyss, they had an eternal existence. Demiurge, a fallen on, was the creator of this world and of man. The Logos, or Christ, was the first, the purest, and highest of the eons, who came to deliver man from the power and dominion of Demiurge. The only begotten Son of God was not the Logos, but

another on. Now, these and other equally crude and false ideas of the Gnostic philosophy was in the mind of the apostle, and gave direction, to some extent, to his train of thought and form of expression. In the text under consideration he evidently, in opposition to the assumptions of Gnosticism, intends to affirm the eternity, personality, and deity of Logos, the Christ. His stand-point of thought is as far back in the inconceivable duration of past eternity as human thought can go. "In the

was not anything made that was made." All things, even matter (not an eternal, essentially evil thing), became, or came into existence, by him. He was the efficient cause of all that is opposed to nothingness. Not in another eon, but "in him was life." In him was life inhering in his nature, not communicated from another, as the light of man is derived from the life of Logos.

The whole train of thought derives its form from the stand-point of the thinker,

predicated, under the title God, all divine attributes, including spirituality, personality, unity, unlimited wisdom, power, and goodness, with holiness, truth, mercy, compassion, and longsuffering. To this same being, under the title God, all divine works are ascribed, and for him are claimed all those affections, services, and devotions which belong only to the Eternal Spirit. To show, therefore, that the inspired writers call Jesus Christ God, in the sense usually attached to that

title, is to show, on Bible authority, that Jesus Christ is God.

Rom. ix. 5: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever." In the natural construction of this passage as it reads, both in the English version and in the original Greek, Christ is called "God blessed forever." That the term God is here used in its highest sense, no one questions. That the term is found in every known manuscript of this Epistle, in every

ancient version extant, and in every quotation of the Fathers, is also conceded. The passage as it stands is not only an unqualified affirmation of the essential deity of our Lord, but is also as direct and positive as language can make it. There is no resort but to criticism. Arian and Soicinian commentators make the last clause a doxology,—Blessed be God forever! Against this construction there are these insuperable objections: First, the original is not in the form of a doxology—it reads,

had been the subject of the clause), all make the common version the true rendering, and the text stands an impregnable demonstration of the divinity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Titus ii, 13, "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ."

The only question here is whether the term "Great God," and the term "Savior Jesus Christ," refer to one and the same individual, or to two. The use of the

Logos who became flesh in the person of our Lord Jesus was one with the Father, true and eternal God.

Son of God. There are in the New Testament over fifty passages in which Christ is called the Son of God, and over forty in which he speaks of God as his Father; calling him not *our* Father, but *my* Father. During the apostolic age, and long after, to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God was regarded as the condition of membership in the Church, and the

by the fact that he was called the Son of God by many persons who could know nothing of his miraculous conception; as, for example, Nathaniel, who evidently supposed him the natural son of Joseph, but nevertheless, on receiving evidence of Christ's omniscience, addressed him, saying, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." Second, by the fact that Christ, when defending his claims to a divine Sonship, never referred to his miraculous conception, but always to

second Psalm. Acts xiii, 32, 33: "The promise which was made unto the fathers God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This passage, however, may be rationally interpreted by Rom. i, 3, 4:

"Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according

against this theory as were urged against the theory of the conception; and again, the term "this day," in the second Psalm, is wholly unintelligible on either the theory of the conception or resurrection.

Another theory, adopted by a large class of interpreters, teaches that Christ is the Son of God because of the Messiahship.

In support of this interpretation, it is alleged that the term "Son of God" is, in very many passages of Scripture, put in juxtaposition with terms

signified by it be also predicated at the same time of the same man. That this is the proper exegesis of our Savior's reply is further evident from what follows in the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth verses, wherein he again directly reasserts his claim to a divine character by saying that by reason of his works it was in their power to know, and was obligatory on them to believe, that "*the Father was in him, and he in the Father.*" That Jesus was understood to claim equality with the Father,

the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high-priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death." The record as given by Mark xiv, and also that by Luke xxii, is nearly in the same words as this quoted from Matthew. All agree in these particulars: The high-priest asked, "Art thou the Son of God? He answered, I am: and the whole council

that makes him equal with God.

That is to say, his Sonship pertains not to his human nature but to his divine nature; filiation in some sense pertains to Deity.

The distinction of persons in the Godhead is founded on something. "The word was with God." A relation subsists of some kind, indicated by the term "*with*," but relation requires plurality, and plurality necessitates characteristics by which one is distinguished from another. Now, it would

greatest being in the universe next to God; or, in other words, the Scripture testimony concerning Christ's Sonship is not satisfactorily interpreted by either the Arian or semi-Arian theories.

Arianism seems to be an effort of the reason to sustain the unity and supremacy of God, and to avoid the difficulties of the Trinity, and doubtless in many minds it accomplishes its object, but to others it is a failure. Though the doctrine of the Sonship be stated in the

terms of the straitest of the orthodox; though it be affirmed that fecundity is as essential to Deity as omnipotence; that God, has a Son by the necessity of his nature; that the Father is a Father by an eternal begetting, and the Son is a Son by an eternal generation, even though the doctrine be stated in the strongest terms used, yet the statement does not, to some minds, present a mystery more inscrutable or difficulties more numerous and insurmountable than does the affirmation of a

Created Creator, or a subordinate Deity. In the light of thought, a first created being, who by delegated power becomes the Creator of all existences, both of matter and of mind, the creator and upholder of all that exists except God, the only manifestation of Deity and the object of all worship, is as unthinkable, as evidently impossible in itself, as any theory of a divine Sonship ever propounded. The whole question of Christology, indeed the entire doctrine of the Trinity, is

this Scripture. To interpret the term "first-born" literally would, so far forth, militate against the theory the passage is quoted to support; for that would make Christ the first *born* being, not the first made, or created. Nothing is gained for any theory by insisting upon a literal interpretation. What, then, is the sense of the term "first-born?" There are only three passages in which this term is applied to Christ. The first is in Rom. viii, 29— "Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be

be inquired in what sense the Father is greater, perhaps no mortal can tell. The context says he is greater in a sense that makes it desirable for Christ to return to him. Christ said to his disciples, "If ye loved me ye would rejoice because I said I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I." The Father had sent him into the world to save the world. The sender in respect to the sending is greater than the sent, though in all other respects the two are equal. The begetter, in respect to the

begetting, is greater than the begotten, though otherwise they are equal. The Father may be the source and foundation of personalities, though the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be one in essence. Plainly some distinction of inequality is conceivable that does not necessitate any idea of a distinct order of being.

Christ, who said "My Father is greater than I," also said, "I and my Father are one;" "I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" "He that hath seen me

hath seen the Father also; how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?" As stated above, an argument has been framed for semi-Arianism founded on the omission of the article in the first verse of John's Gospel. We know not but in our times all antitrinitarians (Socinians, Arians, and semi-Arians), have relinquished all claim to that Scripture, and are disposed rather to say they know not what that passage means than to attempt its explanation, much less derive an argument from it in favor

of their theories. Probably most antitrinitarians of our times reject John's Gospel from the canon, deny its inspiration, and refuse to submit to its authority. The argument, with its answer, is given above, under the title, God, and need not be repeated here.

If these considerations, adduced to show that the title "Son of God" is a divine title, are conclusive, as we think they are most decidedly, then is it clearly established that the Scriptures teach the essential deity of our Lord

of Doctrines;" "distinguish eternal generation from creation by the following particulars: 1. Eternal generation is an offspring out of the eternal essence of God; creation is an origination of a new essence from nothing. 2. Eternal generation is the communication of an eternal essence; creation is the origination of a temporal essence. 3. That which is eternally generated is of one essence with the generator; but that which is created is of another essence from that of the creator. 4. Eternal

that is generated, but a *distinction* in that essence."

It may not be out of place here to say that the creeds of the Church are entitled to respect; the labors of the Fathers are not to be summarily spurned. Sneers at creeds and dogmas are quite too frequent. That the theologians of half a thousand years should employ the strength and energy of their lives in determining whether or not a single letter, and that the smallest in the Greek alphabet, should be rejected from a single word

eternal generation may belong to the same category as its anathemas. This is surely possible, but though it were true it is not to be hastily assumed and the creed summarily rejected. Let what deserves profound respect be profoundly and respectfully considered. What has stood the test of centuries, and been of acknowledged service in the interests of truth and religion, ought not to be rejected unless a competent reason for the rejection be tendered. It is urged as an adequate antecedent objection that

mostly in efforts for defense against heresy; they therefore made known the truth more by informing us of what it is not than by direct statement of what it is. This is eminently true of the topic before us. Is it asked what is meant by the generation of a personal distinction in the deity or divine essence? manifestly no direct and positive answer, such as the questioner requires, can be given. But he is not a good theologian that asks the question; for the same question with equal force

possessing personal characteristics, together with divine attributes, to reveal the *fact* that God immutably one as to essence, subsists in a manner that admits of the personal distinctions, I, thou, he, without attempting to intimate what may be the ground of distinction or the manner of subsistence.

That is to say, there is no revelation on the topic we discuss; man does not know, and cannot know why Jesus Christ is called the Son of God. To be

dogmatically positive on so abstruse a subject is unseemly, and yet we assume that the Trinity was revealed for a purpose, and that it is legitimate to inquire what that revelation is, and so far forth as is possible, to exhaust its contents, that the purpose of its giving may be more surely secured.

The free and abundant use of the terms "Father" and "Son,"

their use without qualification or explanation, without

are readily and easily believed.

3. *Lord*.—Jeremiah xxiii, 5, 6: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice In the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness*." Matt. xxii, 41-45:

"While the Pharisees were gathered together Jesus

asked them, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool?

If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" Luke v, 8:

"When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." vi, 46: "And why

earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands."

2 John 3: "Grace be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."

The title Lord is sometimes used as a title of civility and applied to human masters; on the other hand, it is used both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament as the translation of God's incommunicable name, Jehovah. The argument for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, drawn from

the frequent application of this title to him, turns upon the question whether it was used in a higher or in a lower sense. If we admit that the sacred writers believed in our Savior's divinity, then their use of this title is natural, and the passages where it occurs may, without difficulty, be interpreted; that is to say, the doctrine explains the usage; but if Christ be not a divine person, the use of this term "*Lord*," taken in its connections, is certainly misleading. The doxologies place Christ with a divine title, in juxtaposition with

God the Father. God is represented as addressing Christ under the title "*Lord*," as the creator of heaven and earth. The question of Christ to the Pharisees as to whose son Christ was, if regarded in the light of the orthodox faith, has an easy interpretation and an obvious answer. If we reply, As to his humanity Christ was David's son, as to his divinity he was David's Lord, all is intelligible; otherwise, Christ is confounding the Pharisees and us with an inexplicable enigma. The

several particulars may be noted. The name, "LORD of hosts," in the last clause, is in the original, "Jehovah Sabaoth"—the highest title given to the one eternal God, and possibly may here designate him whom we call God the Father. The term "Lord" in the second clause is "Adonai," usually translated Lord, sometimes God. He is the "messenger of the covenant," "the Lord whom ye" (the Jewish people) "seek, whom ye delight in," whose is the temple; plainly, either Israel's God—the Jehovah of host, or the Messiah.

having sent a messenger before him, would come to his temple; if different, then the text is a promise that the Messiah should come. The Messiah here set forth as a different person from Jehovah, and yet identified with him, and so far forth as identified, bearing the title, Jehovah of hosts, the proprietor of God's temple, and the object of worship to God's people. Now, let us collate this passage with Mark i, 1-4: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God: As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I

send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee; the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." Let the following particulars be noted: The first verse is original; the second, a quotation from Malachi—that given above; and the third, from Isa. xi, 3. In Isaiah the reading is, "Prepare ye the way of the LORD [Jehovah], make straight in the desert a highway for our God [Elohim]." The name Elohim, though not as

beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God. As it is written in the Prophets." In Luke first chapter, it is recorded that Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied of the child John, saying, "And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways." Again, in Luke vii, 27, Christ says of John the Baptist, "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face which shall prepare thy way before

thee." The prophecy that Jehovah would suddenly come to his temple, imports that he would come soon or immediately after the appearance of his forerunner, suddenly, or immediately after the voice of him crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make straight a high-way for our God." He, Jehovah, would come to his temple.

John the Baptist utters the voice, preaches repentance, and gives notice of the coming of Jehovah; Jesus Christ comes to the temple

with them are spoken of. When God appeared to Moses on Mount Horeb, and spoke to him out of the burning bush, commissioning him to go down into Egypt and lead Israel out of bondage, Moses inquired, Exod. iii, 13-17: "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? God said unto Moses, I AM that I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the

children, I AM hath sent me unto you.

And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, the LORD [Jehovah] God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. And say unto them, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt: And I have said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanites, unto a land flowing with

milk and honey." It is sufficient for the present purpose to note here, that it is Jehovah that appears to Moses and he, Jehovah, promises to bring Israel up out of the affliction of Egypt. In the sixth chapter the same things are repeated with increased emphasis. "God spake to Moses and said, I am Jehovah, I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them. I have established my covenant with them to give them the

land of Canaan. I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians keep in bondage, and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, I will rid you of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments. And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, which bringeth you

and Levitical priesthood was instituted, the laws, the commandments, the judgments were given, and they are recorded from the twentieth chapter onward, beginning with these words: "And God spake all these words, saying, I am the LORD [Jehovah], thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Here note that the being or person, as pleases, who was revealed on Mount Horeb to Moses as JEHOVAH, and who promised to bring

that God was their guide,
their deliverer, and the
giver of their inheritance,
until we come to the record
concerning the golden calf.
Exod. xxxiii, 1-3: "And the
LORD said unto Moses,
Depart, and go up hence,
thou and the people which
thou hast brought up out of
the land of Egypt, unto the
land which I swear unto
Abraham, to Isaac, and to
Jacob, saying, Unto thy
seed will I give it: And I
will send an Angel before
thee, and I will drive out
the Canaanite, the Amorite,
and the Hittite: unto a land
flowing with milk and

"And Moses said unto the LORD, See, thou sayest unto me, Bring up this people, and thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me. If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence.

For wherein shall it be known that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? And the LORD said unto Moses, I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken."

Here it is to be remarked that while the promise to send "*mine* angel"

Now, we turn to Jeremiah xxxi, 31-34: "Behold the days come, saith the LORD [Jehovah], that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I make with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.

But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and

write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Beyond question this is a reference to the covenant of Sinai, and a prophecy that the same being or person who made that older covenant would, in after days, make a new one; in which the law of God should be, by the supernatural spiritual

agency of the same Jehovah, written in the hearts of men. In Hebrew viii, 8-11, this prophecy of Jeremiah is quoted well-nigh verbatim in connection with an argument to show that Christ was "the Mediator of a better covenant established upon better promises." Eleven chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, beginning with the announcement that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days

such as, "Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt," and "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed by serpents;" but the argument does not require it. If we adopt the trinitarian theology and conceive that the infinite God comes out of his eternity and reveals himself to the world but seldom in the person of the Father, usually in the person of the Son; that by the Son, chiefly, God creates, upholds, and

ascribed to Christ, and ascribed in such connections as forbid any other construction than that which regards the terms as used in their highest sense.

ATTRIBUTES.

Divine attributes are ascribed to Christ Characteristics which belong to no being but God; perfections without limitation, infinite and absolute, are in so many instances ascribed to Christ, that if Christ be not God, then is the Bible the most misleading book

extant—misleading in a matter fundamental to religion; and if an error, the greatest error the human mind can embrace; unless it be thought that atheism were a greater error than the worship of a creature. Nor is this mere theory; for, during nearly two thousand years, Christendom, with inconsiderable exceptions, has understood the Bible as teaching the divinity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; and the practice and experience of well-nigh the whole Christian Church has conformed to this faith.

1. *Eternity and Immutability.*—Isaiah ix, 6: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father." That this is a prophecy of the incarnation of Christ and a description of his nature and offices, is sufficiently evident from the fact that it will apply to no one else; and that it affirms both his humanity and divinity is evident, because it is not applicable to him unless he

be both human and divine. The name "Everlasting Father" has no meaning unless it affirm his eternity. It has been rendered "The Father of the Everlasting age," and "The Father of Eternity." What may be the precise reason for the form of the expression may be above the possibilities of human knowledge. A metaphysical speculation may be innocent here, even though it be useless. In the order of thought, succession is antecedent to duration. Were there not in consciousness an apprehension of

apprehension of his own successive thoughts was the occasion of, was the source of, was the Father of the everlasting age; his conscious being was that which rendered eternity a rational conception. Taken in this view, the term "Everlasting Father" predicates eternity in the highest conceivable sense. This, in the absence of anything better, may, psychologically, account for the form of the expression; but all this aside, the title in any case affirms the eternity of our Lord Jesus Christ. John i, 2: "The

same was in the beginning with God." Fix any point in past eternity as "the beginning," and Logos was; therefore he is eternal.

John viii, 57, 58: "Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, *I am*." No interpretation worthy of discussion can be given these words of our Lord, other than that which makes the passage an unqualified claim to eternal

existence. The Socinian gloss given above, under the head of Christ's pre-existence, does not merit repetition. Heb. xiii, 8: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Here both immutability and eternity are predicated of Christ. Heb. i, 10, 12: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they

shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." In this, as in Psalm cii, from which it is quoted, God is addressed as existent before all worlds; as the creator of all things; as having absolute power to preserve and to destroy with infinite ease, and as remaining the same after great changes in the material universe; all of which has primary reference to the underlying ideas of immutability and eternity. That in Hebrews the passage is applied to God's Son does not admit of question. Therefore, on

the authority of this Scripture, the attributes of immutability and eternity are ascribed to Christ. Rev. i, 17, 18: "I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead." xxii, 13: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. In Rev. i, 8, it is written, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."

That these are the words of the risen and ascended Christ, who made the

revelation to his servant John, is apparent on the whole surface of the book. It is Christ that speaks every-where else, and, therefore, surely here. That eternity, immutability, and unlimited power are claimed is beyond dispute.

2. *Omnipresence*.—John iii, 13: No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." The assumption that to ascend to heaven is to learn religious truths, and to come down from heaven is

to teach them, requires no reply, since it obviously makes the passage teach what is false, for other men besides Jesus have learned and taught religion. This means nothing, or teaches falsehood, or Jesus was in some sense in heaven when he, incarnate, was on earth in conversation with Nicodemus. To be in heaven and in earth at the same time is not, to human thought, possible to any but to him who fills all space with an all-pervading presence. Matt. xviii. 20: "For where two or three are gathered together in my

and its exalted privilege in prayer; namely, the presence of Christ himself, the great Head of the Church, in every assembly, however small, that shall be gathered in his name and shall agree to ask according to his will. That due reverence for divine authority, proper caution that proceedings be according to the divine will, and appropriating faith in the divine promise that whatsoever is asked shall be done, could be inspired by the promise of a figurative presence, it is preposterous to suppose.

himself sufficient for the things committed to his charge, or for the things required at his hand; his sufficiency is of God; his trust and confidence is in the promise, "Lo! I am with you alway." All true ministers in all parts of the world, all at the same time, are conscious of such a need; all trust in the same promise in this same sense, and all find the promise fulfilled according to their faith. Thus to sustain his servants, Christ must be every-where. Col. i, 16, 17: "By him were all things created that are in heaven

3. *Omniscience*.—It is objected against the ascription of infinite knowledge to our Lord Jesus Christ that he himself says, Mark xiii, 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only." This is confessedly the strongest anti-trinitarian text in the Bible; if anywhere in the Holy Scriptures the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is denied, it is in this passage. But the denial is antagonized by so many Scripture evidences that

so, how can he be ignorant of the day of judgment? an explanation is required. Some have questioned the genuineness of the clause "neither the Son," but though the clause is not found in the parallel passage, Matt. xxiv, 36, the objection is not generally satisfactory. Others affirm that the term "know" in this passage should be taken in the causative sense, cause to know; that is, to teach or declare, as when St. Paul says he is determined to know nothing but Christ and him crucified; and allege that

Acts i, 7, is a parallel text,—
"It is not for you to know
the times and the seasons
which the Father hath put
in his own power;" that is
to say, both passages affirm
that no man, neither the
angels nor the Son
proclaims the day of
judgment, the Father
having reserved the right of
proclamation to himself.
This might do, if it were
easy to conceive in what
sense, how, or when, the
Father is to proclaim it. If,
by the actual coming of the
day itself, the words of
Christ seem, if not void of
meaning, to be a most

is spoken of as "knowing what is in man," "perceiving the thoughts" of those about him, and knowing in such away and to such an extent as implies the knowledge of all things.

4. *Omnipotence*.—The unlimited power of Christ is evinced by the works ascribed to him.

5. *Works*.—Creation is ascribed to Christ in John i, 3: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made;" also, in verse tenth, "He was in the world, and the world was

made by him, and the world knew him not." Col. i, 16: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Heb. i, 2: "By whom also he made the worlds:" ver. 10: "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands." This

justly charged with using language so misleading as to destroy all confidence in their writings. The Bible is of no value, is not worthy of consideration, if its language is so foreign to its intended thoughts. That the work spoken of in the first verse of Genesis and in the first verse of John is such a work as could be done by any power that can be delegated seems preposterous. Creation, whatever it is, is everywhere referred to in the Bible as a work of the infinite God; a work that requires all power. No

Christ preserves and governs all things. The passages above quoted sufficiently affirm this: "He upholds all things by the word of his power. My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works." Here Christ claims to do the same things that God does in preserving and governing the world.

He forgives sin, Luke v, 20-24: "And when he saw their faith he said unto him,

Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. And the Scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?

But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, he answering said unto them, What reason ye in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins (he said unto the sick of the

upon her, and she shall live." Here is worship paid and received, which was offered in the faith that he could raise the dead; was it a mere act of politeness? or was it an act of religious worship? xiv, 23: "Then they that were in the ship came and worshiped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." They call him the Son of God, a divine title; they worship him as such, and the special inspiration of their devotion at that time was awakened by witnessing his power over the winds and the waves, in that he

Does the Bible recognize any worship of superior beings or disembodied spirits, not God, as lawful? In the instances recorded of worship paid to Christ after his resurrection and ascension, may that worship be of an inferior grade of devotion, and such as may be paid to a being less than God? The total absence of any intimation of a superior and an inferior worship, together with the injunction everywhere insisted upon to worship God and him alone, would seem sufficient to settle such a

Luke xxiv, 51, 52: "He was parted from them and carried up into heaven; and they worshiped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Acts i. 24: " And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." That this prayer was offered to Christ may be reasonably inferred from the recognized fact that Christ himself appoints his apostles and ministers. He is the head of his Church, and the source of all power and authority invested in

it be considered how it could be to the glory of God the Father that the intelligences of the universe should worship Christ, confessing that he is Lord, unless he is really so. And again, how could the condescension of any being less than God be rightly deserving of such divine honor? If, however, the trinitarian idea be admitted, and the eternal Logos be conceived as emptying himself of the glory he had with the Father before the world was, and becoming flesh and being obedient unto

whosoever believeth might not perish, but have everlasting life. It is the will of the Father that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.

The conscious adoration awakened in a pious mind by an apprehension of redeeming love is unto God, through Christ; the love of the Father and the love of the Son are both one and equal, and the honor is one and equal. The exaltation of the God-man in this view calls forth a responsive amen from the admiring and adoring

2 Thess. ii, 16, 17: "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and establish you in every good work—a prayer offered equally to Christ and the Father for spiritual blessings. 2 Tim. iv, 22: "The Lord Jesus be with thy spirit"—prayer offered exclusively to Christ. 1 Cor. i, 2: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all

prayers of saints; and they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, saying with a

worshipped him that liveth forever and ever.

Rev. vii, 9, 10: After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindred and people and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands, and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

Such is a brief representation of the Scripture testimony

as essentially, eternally and necessarily *one*; and the same difficulty is found in attempting to conceive the mode of the hypostatic union in Christ, how two natures can be so united as to constitute one person. These difficulties, however, are of the same nature, though perhaps greater, if one impossibility can be greater than another, as the difficulty found in every attempt we make to conceive the absolute and the infinite. God is incomprehensible; we can no more comprehend ubiquity than we can

obvious that without such a wresting of the Word of God as annihilates all reliable significance, a very large portion of the inspired writings must be interpreted as teaching a threefold distinction in the personality of the Godhead, and when with this distinction all Scripture harmonizes, it becomes impossible to accept the Bible as authoritative in any common-sense acceptation without also accepting the trinitarian idea of God as the proper and legitimate

CHAPTER 13: THE PERSONALITY AND DIVINITY SPIRIT.

THE doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as held by the Church during the times of the apostolic fathers and for some time subsequently, was what is revealed on the surface of the Scriptures. The disciple was baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The benedictions of the Church recognized the three, then, as now. To the Church, the Father was God, whose law had been

and inconsistent statements appeared among the most devout and orthodox.

The Bible ascribes the same work at one time to the Father, at another to the Son, and at yet another to the Holy Spirit.

Hence, the Patripassians affirmed but one person; the Sabellians declared the Son and Spirit to be but influences, emanations.

The Arians affirmed that the Father created the Son, and the Son created the Spirit. Many regarded the

Constantinople has these words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the life giving, who proceedeth from the Father, who is to be worshiped and glorified with the Father and the Son, and who spake through the prophets." The creed of Constantinople was not satisfactory to all minds, chiefly for two reasons: first, the Holy Spirit was not declared to be consubstantial with the Father and the Son; the term *homoousian*, much insisted upon by the orthodox, was omitted; second, it was declared that

the Spirit proceeds from the Father only; not from the Father and the Son. At the Synod of Toledo in 589, the term *filioque*,"and the Son," was added to the symbol of Constantinople. This constituted, and still constitutes, an important dogmatic difference between the Eastern and Western Churches. The so-called Athanasian creed affirms that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son; that he is uncreated, eternal, and omnipotent, equal in majesty and glory, and that

he proceeds from the Father and the Son.

This is the present creed of the Church. During the centuries since the formulation of the creed, an opinion, perhaps more correctly a sentiment, has prevailed to an appreciable extent, and still prevails, antagonistic to the doctrine of the Spirit's personality; namely, that the Spirit of God is the power of God, is a manifested energy, not a person. It is needful, therefore, only to present those Scriptures in which the personality of the Spirit

is affirmed or plainly implied. The same Scriptures that teach his personality teach also his divinity. That when the Scriptures speak of the Spirit of God, they speak of God himself: that when they affirm that the Spirit does this or that work, they affirm that God does it, will not be questioned. That the Spirit is divine is conceded. Is he a person distinct from the Father and the Son? If so, trinitarianism is taught in the Bible; if not, not.

A person is a subject who is the conscious author of an

evident the former is literal and the latter figurative; so that we must conceive of the Spirit not as fire personified, but as mind literally susceptible of grief.

The creed affirms that the Spirit *proceeds* from the Father and the Son. That he proceeds from the Father is directly stated, especially in John xv, 25: "When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth *which proceedeth from the Father*, he shall testify of me." But the Spirit is

frequently spoken of as sustaining the same relation to the Son as to the Father, and never in any different relation. He is called the Spirit of God and, the Spirit of the Father; he is also called the Spirit of the Son. He is said to be sent by the Father, and is also sent by the Son. If, then, the relations of the Spirit to the Son be in all other regards the same as his relations to the Father, it would seem that the Church is thereby fully warranted in affirming, as it does, that he proceeds from the Father *and the*

where else, lies outside the purview of human science. We know no more of the procession of the Spirit than we do of the generation of the Son; we know nothing of either, beyond the Bible affirmation of the facts that the Son is begotten of the Father, and that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Gen. i, 2: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Psalm xxxiii, 6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by

the breath (spirit) of his mouth." Job xxxiii, 4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." Here the Spirit is represented as connected with the work of creation, and the texts, taken in connection with other portions of the Word of inspiration, plainly ascribe creation to the Spirit, as they also ascribe creation to the Father and to the Son. Psalm civ, 27-30:

"These all wait upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season.

wisdom, power, executive efficiency, of extraordinary purity and holiness; all of which implies, that the Spirit given unto them was a somewhat possessing personal qualities. Acts xiii, 1-4; "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.

So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost departed unto Seleucia." This language is misleading, if nothing more be meant than that the brethren who

them forth. That this implies that the Spirit is a person is evident without comment. Acts xv, 28: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Is this simply saying, that it was the pious judgment of the apostles that circumcision should not be required of Gentile converts? If not merely this, then the apostolic council had knowledge of the divine will communicated to them by the Holy Ghost as being the will of the Holy Ghost. The

Spirit, then, must be a divine person. Rom. viii, 26: "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Interceding with an intensity of interest expressed by unutterable groanings, is certainly the act of a person. A thing, an attribute, an influence, an exerted power, cannot be conceived of as interceding at all, much less with such intensity of interest, such depth of sympathy. Acts v, 3, 4: "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the

Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." Can men lie to an influence, an attribute, a power? Here, not only is personality plainly implied, but divinity is also at least apparently asserted. The assertion is not equal to the words, The Holy Ghost is God; but if the Spirit be not God, then Peter spoke carelessly, in a manner fatally misleading. To say that Ananias lied to the Holy Ghost, and in the same breath to say he lied to God, is certainly well-nigh saying the Holy Ghost is God.

earnest of our inheritance." Rom. viii, 14-17: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. . . . Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba," Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."

Here the seal, the Spirit of promise, the Spirit of adoption, the witness, the evidence of sonship and heirship, all the same, are

that he abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given; hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit."

Mark iii, 28, 29: "Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Can blasphemy against anything or person that is

redemption, and salvation, and also in the baptismal formula, and in the apostolic benediction, that we are warranted in affirming that the Bible teaches that the Holy Spirit is a divine person, equal in power, majesty, and eternity with the Father and the Son.

CHAPTER 14: DIRECT TESTIMONY AS TO THE TRINITY.

THE question why this doctrine of the trinity is revealed not directly but indirectly is not pertinent. The question is, Is it

otherwise accounted for, yet it is in harmony with the idea of a plurality; and it is possible, it cannot be shown to the contrary, that the word God is in the plural form in the original, purposely to teach this idea of a plurality in unity.

But, in the twenty-sixth verse, the plural form is used, and no other explanation than that of the orthodox faith is even plausible. "Let *us* make man in our image, after our likeness."

Here is a plain intimation of what the creed states in

form. Is it not even direct testimony as to the idea of a plural distinction in the Godhead? The distinction between Jehovah and the angel of Jehovah, and yet the identity of the two, more than suggests plurality in unity. The triple form of the Jewish benediction, the ritualistic forms of Christian baptism, and the apostolic benediction, approach the authority of a direct affirmation. The threefold form of adoration noted in Isaiah's vision, "Holy! holy! holy! is the LORD of hosts." has a significance

pointing in the same direction. When the record of this vision is collated with New Testament references to it, the case seems decisive. The record is in Isaiah, sixth chapter, in which the prophet is commissioned to go unto the people and say unto them: "Ye hear but do not understand, ye see but do not perceive." That in this vision Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, is revealed, will not be questioned. In John xii, 41, quoting this message of the prophet to the people, the evangelist says: "These things said

the hearts of believers, and the Holy Ghost dwells in the hearts of believers; it is the same indwelling Spirit that enlightens, regenerates, comforts, guides, and saves. And yet the Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Spirit proceeds. Paternity is never ascribed to the Son, and filiation never to the Father, and neither to the Spirit. The Father says I, the Son says I, and the Spirit says I. There are three persons, but one God—three in one—a holy Trinity, blessed forever and ever. Amen.

CHAPTER 15: THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

FROM every stand-point of thought obtained in the Bible, God is postulated. The divine existence is antecedent to all beings and things else. There is nothing anterior to God; there is nothing exterior to him that is independent of him. Every existent being or thing, that is not God, is indebted for existence to the divine will. All entities and events are what they are, either by the immediate act of God or by

he creates a brute, and treats it as a brute should be treated; he creates a devil, or, which is the same thing, he creates a good spirit, with a purpose or decree by which he becomes a demon, and then treats him in a manner corresponding with his demoniac character. Men kill serpents because they are serpents, not because they are to blame for being what they are; and if the necessitarian theory be true, they should hang murderers for the same reason, namely, because

between antecedent and consequent is maintained throughout the whole; the law of necessity governs all existences and all events.

But it is said that these consequences are just as deducible from the foreknowledge of God as from his decrees; the decree doing nothing more than to secure the certainty of the event foreknown. That necessitarianism is involved in the admission of the divine prescience seems in the consideration of the abettors of this theory the stronghold of

their system; they seem to rely upon it more than upon any other metaphysical argument. Now, so far as we are concerned, the labor of constructing this argument might be avoided; for all that foreknowledge does is to prove the certainty of future events, and that must be admitted without proof; all things will be as they will be, whether known or not, whether decreed or not; the future history of the universe will be in one single way and not two. But, while this is true, it is also true that an

contrary—he prefers sin to holiness in cases where sin occurs.

This is a plain non sequitur—he chose the *existence* of moral beings in preference to their *non-existence*; he did not choose, prefer, purpose, or decree their sin; he has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, and, therefore, he has never brought to pass a state of things in which death was unavoidable.

The existence of moral beings, in any condition infinite goodness will

less to omnipotence, we may say with less expense without than with sin. Some have answered this optimistic argument by saying that it cannot be affirmed that, among actually existing conditions of finite beings, there is any best, since nothing finite can be conceived to which omnipotence may not add something. This, though probably not satisfactory, is not evidently fallacious. If fallacious, its fallacy, so far as we know, has never been shown.

he decreed that wrath, or was at all dependent upon it for the accomplishment of his purposes. The argument stated syllogistically in a definite case would stand thus: Whatever God employs for the accomplishment of his purposes is essential to his purpose; God employed the malignity of the Jews to accomplish his purpose of redemption; therefore, the malignity of the Jews was essential to God's purpose of redemption. Is God thus dependent upon sin and sinners? Could not the world be redeemed unless

competent to govern an infinite number of morally responsible beings, persons who have power within limits of determining what they will do; and we insist upon it that this conception of a divine government is incomparably superior to that of our opponents.

GOD IS AN ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN.

"At the end of the days, I Nebuchadnezzar lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honored him

that liveth forever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion and his kingdom is from generation to generation, and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing, and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou? The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all. Thy kingdom is an

everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations. Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? or shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it? O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor?"

That God is a sovereign is not disputed. All who believe in God, who have faith in the divine personality, regard him as sole sovereign of the universe; all existences and events are subject to his control; without his power existences cannot be, and without his permission events cannot take place. His sovereignty is absolute. His will is law, and is independent of all other wills. He gives no account of his matters, and is accountable to no one for what he is, or for what he does; his counsels, plans,

NATURAL GOVERNMENT.

Does God govern the material world and irrational creatures by a mediate or by an immediate agency? Did God in the beginning volitionate all the forces by which the existence and history of things and irresponsible beings are what they are, or is each event of such existences and histories a product of an immediate volition of the infinite will? Does God govern the world by what are called "general laws,"

or by single separate volitions? This question may be stated in still other forms, but it is one and the same question, and involves the doctrine of God's natural government and the doctrine of miracles and a divine providence.

To answer the question is confessedly difficult, to give an answer satisfactory to all thinkers is evidently, in the present state of human knowledge, impossible. To pronounce dogmatically that God governs the world thus and

for industry, for effort of any kind? What security for safety or well-being in any condition? Obviously the race must perish. If God did not govern the world by uniform laws, if there were nothing stable and immutable in God's government of the physical world, man could not, being what he is, subsist for a single day.

Again, the common idea of the divine omnipresence makes him an observer of all that transpires. His omniscience involves the idea of a perfect cognizance

goes forth to the labors of life in the strength that God giveth him.

He holds the oceans in the hollow of his hand, and the winds obey his mandate. The brightness of the sun and the beauty of the moon are his. The mote that floats in the air, and the worlds that revolve in space, move as they are moved by his power—all things are subject to his will.

When, for moral and religious purposes, God wills to make special manifestations of himself,

man can understand but a very small part of his ways, is evident. These are conceptions having exclusive reference to that part of the universe with which the earth and the inhabitants thereof are connected. For aught that man knows to the contrary, there are systems of worlds where gravitation, cohesion, and chemical affinities are unknown—where what we call the laws of nature have no application or existence.

MORAL GOVERNMENT.

The moral government of God is his government of morally responsible beings, and consists in the means he employs for the security of moral excellence in their character and conduct.

This includes the creation, preservation, and providential care of beings capable of moral excellence, the enactment and publication of moral laws, the bestowment of promised rewards in cases of obedience, and the execution of threatened

penalties in cases of disobedience. Moral government as affected by redemption includes a system of means by which rebels may be pardoned and restored to loyal obedience and to the immunities and privileges of citizenship. The distinction between the natural and moral government of God is founded, if properly considered, not only upon the different subjects to which it applies, but also upon the nature of the government itself. For, if we affirm that the

prevails without exception, whatever is, is by the power of God, and there is no power external to the divine will by which it might be otherwise; in the other, the law of contingency prevails; whatever is, is by an adequate power divinely bestowed, which is also itself an adequate power to the contrary. The cause of irresponsible existences, with all the phenomena they exhibit, is the sole will of God; he might have willed that they should be otherwise as they are, but having willed their

existences as they are, they are thereby constituted second and unipotent causes, adequate only to one sole result.

But in cases of responsible action, the agent is, by the constitution of his nature, made a first and pluripotent cause, adequate to either of several different results.

This common distinction of the government of God into natural and moral is, then, scientific, because natural; and founded upon a radical difference in kind. The divine control over inert

matter, over vegetable and animal life, and over beings merely intellectual and sentient—not moral and religious—is a control by an efficient agency, by a causative power, invariably and immediately producing its designed results. The divine control over beings moral, religious, and therefore responsible, is entirely of a different nature, and may be characterized as a *persuasive power*. Beings endowed with the power of choice are influenced by others in the choices they make, in no other way than

grounds for certain knowledge, that man is endowed with all the elements of a moral responsibility.

It is axiomatic that that for which any agent is morally responsible must be within his control. If man be responsible for obedience or disobedience to the divine commands, then obedience and disobedience are both equally within his power.

Which of them shall result is not determined by anything external to himself. His own power of

persuading motives presented men to induce them to choose the right and avoid the wrong. But none of them separately, nor all combined, secure results. The issue is dependent upon the man himself—he chooses whom he will serve. He may know that the Lord is God—that is, he may have every motive for right service, and yet choose to serve Baal; and it is solely because he is endowed with power to choose the Lord or Baal, the one equally with the other, that he is

But again, it is said such cases are trifling and exceptional, and therefore not proper data for philosophic inference. We reply, such cases are more numerous than all others combined. We volitionate in thousands of indifferent things every day of life.

Cases of conscious virtue and vice are, in comparison with these indifferent decisions, very few and far between.

PRAYER.

The view we have taken of the government of God in

for an interference with these, except in cases of great emergency, of extreme necessity, will be effectual. Prayer offered in submission to, and in accordance with, the will of God will secure for him that prays what he would not receive if he did not pray. "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened." The divine control over all persons and things is adequate basis for that policy of government which makes prayer the stated antecedent of the reception

of such blessings as it may please God to condition upon it.

PROVIDENCE.

In like manner; a trust in Providence is both Scriptural and rational. God's supervision of all events furnishes abundant opportunity for such direction as may be needful for the well-being of his people; and if it be his will so to direct occurrences as that the steps of such as acknowledge the Lord in all their ways shall be specially directed, there is certainly reasonable assurance that

the steps of such shall be so directed— that there shall take place for the benefit of the truly pious what would not take place were they not thus minded toward the Lord. We know that all things work together for good to them that love God—to them that are the called according to his purpose.

ANGELS.

The subjects of God's moral government are all beings capable of moral obligation. Among these are not only men, but also angels. Of these we have no

knowledge, except so far as is revealed to us in the Word of God. They are superior to man; are of different ranks and orders; are very numerous; are wholly spiritual, not material, though capable of assuming material forms and appearances. They have great power, and can do wonders, but their power is derived and dependent. They cannot create, or work miracles, except as specially empowered. They cannot act without means. They cannot search the hearts of men; their interventions

with the affairs of men are only such as God permits or commands. They are limited as to place; they are somewhere, not everywhere; but can move from place to place with great rapidity. They were originally holy, but were subjected to a period of probation, in which some kept their first estate and others did not. They are employed in the worship of God, and in obedience to God's commands they come among men and specially minister to the heirs of salvation. Evil, fallen angels, or devils, are

